

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 311 743

HE 020 919

TITLE History of Higher Education Annual. Volume 6.
1986.

INSTITUTION Rochester Univ., N.Y.

PUB DATE 86

NOTE 124p.

AVAILABLE FROM History of Higher Education Annual, Graduate School
of Education and Human Development, 301 Lattimore
Hall, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY 14627
(\$10.00).

PUB TYPE Books (010)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Development; *Educational History;
*Educational Quality; *Foundations of Education;
*Higher Education; Modern History; *Religion; Sex;
*Womens Education

ABSTRACT

A series of papers on the history of higher education is presented with a focus on the interaction of gender and religion with the curriculum in shaping educational experiences and outcomes. Papers are as follows: "Introduction to Volume Six" (Lynn D. Gordon); "Farmer's Daughters: The Education of Women at Alfred Academy and University Before the Civil War" (Kathryn M. Kerns); "'The Kind of Knowledge of Most Worth to Young Women': Post-Secondary Vocational Training for Teaching and Motherhood at the Wheelock School, 1888-1914" (Barbara Beatty); "The Challenge of Jane Addams: A Research Note" (Ellen Condliffe Lagemann); "Education for Equality: Women's Rights Periodicals and Women's Higher Education, 1849-1929" (Patricia Smith Butcher); "The Turning Point in American Jesuit Higher Education: The Standardization Controversy Between the Jesuits and the North Central Association, 1915-1940" (Lester F. Goodchild); and "Celebrating Fair Harvard" (Suzanne Hildenbrand). (SM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED311743

HISTORY OF HIGHER EDUCATION ANNUAL

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Harold S. Wechsler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Volume 6

1986

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.



An annual publication under the auspices
of the University of Rochester

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 020 919

EDITORIAL BOARD

Joyce Antler, *Brandeis University*

Joan N. Burstyn, *Syracuse University*

E. D. Duryea, Editor Emeritus, *State University of New York at Buffalo*

Arthur Engel, *Virginia Commonwealth University*

Lynn D. Gordon, *University of Rochester*

Peter Dobkin Hall, *Yale University*

Jurgen Herbst, *University of Wisconsin-Madison*

Konrad H. Jarausch, *University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*

Alan Karp, Managing Editor, *Teachers College, Columbia University*

James McLachlan, *New York, New York*

Walter P. Metzger, *Columbia University*

Patricia A. Palmieri, *Dartmouth College*

David B. Potts, *Wesleyan University*

Douglas Sloan, *Teachers College, Columbia University*

Harold S. Wechsler, Editor, *State University of New York at Buffalo*

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENTS

Kenneth Charlton, King's College, University of London

Robin Harris, University of Toronto

David R. Jones, University of Melbourne, Australia

Rüdiger vom Gruch, Universität München, Germany

The HISTORY OF HIGHER EDUCATION ANNUAL, published under the auspices of the University of Rochester, Rochester, New York, covers all historical approaches to the study of higher education, both nationally and internationally.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Individual subscriptions to the *Annual* are \$10 in the United States and Canada, and \$12.50 to Latin America and overseas. Institutional subscriptions are \$12.50 in the United States and Canada, and \$15 to Latin America and overseas. All orders must be prepaid in U.S. funds, payable to the University of Rochester. Send orders to History of Higher Education Annual, Graduate School of Education and Human Development, 301 Lattimore Hall, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627.

© 1986, History of Higher Education Annual

History of Higher Education Annual 1986

CONTENTS

Statement	<i>President Dennis O'Brien</i>	5
Statement	<i>Dean Guilbert Hentschke</i>	5
Introduction to Volume Six	<i>Lynn D. Gordon</i>	7
ARTICLES		
Farmers' Daughters: The Education of Women at Alfred Academy and University Before the Civil War	<i>Kathryn M. Kerns</i>	11
"The Kind of Knowledge of Most Worth to Young Women": Post-Secondary Vocational Training for Teaching and Motherhood at the Wheelock School, 1888-1914	<i>Barbara Beatty</i>	29
The Challenge of Jane Addams: A Research Note	<i>Ellen Condliffe Lagemann</i>	51
Education for Equality: Women's Rights Periodicals and Women's Higher Education, 1849-1920	<i>Patricia Smith Butcher</i>	63
The Turning Point in American Jesuit Higher Education: The Standardization Controversy Between the Jesuits and the North Central Association, 1915-1940	<i>Lester F. Goodchild</i>	81
REVIEW ESSAY		
Celebrating Fair Harvard	<i>Suzanne Hildenbrand</i>	117
ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS		125
MANUSCRIPT SUBMISSION INFORMATION		127

The Cover—Sibley Hall of the University of Rochester as it appeared when new in 1877. It served as the main library of the University until 1930. From W. H. McIntosh, *History of Monroe County, New York . . .* (Philadelphia, 1877). Courtesy of Karl Kabelac, Librarian, Rare Books, Rush Rhees Library, University of Rochester.

STATEMENTS OF WELCOME

PRESIDENT DENNIS O'BRIEN **University of Rochester**

The University of Rochester is pleased and honored to become the home of a distinguished journal, the *History of Higher Education Annual*, whose interests and themes are close to those of our faculty (and incidentally of the President). In welcoming and wishing the journal well, we also welcome Dr. Harold Wechsler to membership in the University community.

DEAN GUILBERT C. HENTSCHE

Graduate School of Education and Human Development, University of Rochester

Since its founding six years ago, the *History of Higher Education Annual* has established an enviable national and international reputation as a leading journal of scholarship and thought on issues of higher education. With a board of editors consisting of scholars from the United States and abroad, the *Annual* has brought a much needed historical perspective to the field, enabling educators to examine more critically and thoroughly current directions in higher education.

It is especially appropriate that the *History of Higher Education Annual* be housed in the University of Rochester's Graduate School of Education and Human Development. Our commitment to the journal grows out of our philosophy that broad cultural, social, and historical understandings of institutions are essential to improved contemporary educational practices.

I welcome the *Annual* to our campus and look forward to a fruitful relationship between the School and the *Annual's* board and readership.



Introduction to Volume Six

LYNN D. GORDON

University of Rochester

THE ARTICLES IN THIS VOLUME of the *History of Higher Education Annual* demonstrate growing complexity, diversity, and breadth in the history of American higher education. Until recently the field consisted largely of detailed institutional histories, usually with an administrative focus, and works of grand synthesis, based on secondary sources or research at a few archives of prestigious institutions. These essays, however, come from archival research at less well-known schools, and deal with thematic issues as well. Moreover, the focus on gender and on religion illustrates the success these historians of education have had working within the broader context of American social and cultural history; looking at how the educational history of outsiders relates to the mainstream. In particular, the authors in this volume emphasize the interaction of gender and religion with the curriculum in shaping educational experiences and outcomes.

Kathryn M. Kerns's article analyzes institutional and demographic sources at a small western New York academy/college/normal school in the years before the Civil War. Dealing with coeducation, religion, teacher education, and vocationalism, she, like David Potts, Colin Burke, James McLachlan, David Allmendinger, and others, contributes to a re-definition of ante-bellum higher education. Kerns's work informs us that not all institutions of that era can be interpreted by their relationship to the 20th century research university. Alfred served as a college for some students; a normal school and even a high school for others. Kerns finds the teacher education curriculum, and the vocational orientation of women students key ingredients in establishing a relatively egalitarian atmosphere at Alfred. Unlike Oberlin, where women prepared to be wives of ministers and missionaries, Alfred provided "separate but equally valued spheres for men and women." Her analysis of students' socio-economic backgrounds shows that many women combined careers in education with marriage and family ties. This picture of female students' post-graduate lives contrasts sharply with that drawn by Kathryn Kish Sklar, David Allmendinger, and Anne Firor Scott, in their discussions of Mt. Holyoke Seminary and the Emma Willard School. Graduates of those institutions often remained single; if married, they ceased to be teachers. Kerns attributes the differences to the shared duties of the household farm economy, a lifestyle lasting much longer in western New York than in New England, and to

the resulting type of coeducation found at Alfred. Men's work and women's work, shaped by a shared education, did not separate after marriage.

Barbara Beatty's work on Lucy Wheelock's kindergarten training school also adds to our knowledge of higher education outside liberal arts colleges and research universities. Set in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the paper gives us first an educational biography of Lucy Wheelock, and ultimately an analysis of the relationship between gender, curriculum, and vocation. Intellectually and chronologically a member of the first generation of college women, Wheelock chose not to attend Wellesley, moving instead directly into early childhood education. Her disapproval of women obtaining a "man's education" led her to shape a curriculum specifically tailored to women's needs as mothers and teachers. Wheelock drew on the ideas of Froebel, G. Stanley Hall, and others to create a rigorous and structured program. Although in some ways her life's work represented a conservative reaction against the intellectual egalitarianism of the Seven Sisters Colleges and the careerism of the feminists, she, like the home economists of the Progressive Era, valued women's traditional work with children, and sought to enhance it. Concerned about the depression and sense of failure faced by many women college graduates, who found it difficult to use their "man's education," Wheelock's school established links between higher education and vocation.

In her "Research Note," Ellen Condliffe Lagemann continues the discussion of the relationship between women's higher education and their careers. Lagemann shows that Jane Addams, whose life exemplified the problems and possibilities for educated women of the early twentieth century, had misgivings about the social utility of universities. Although she valued research, scholarship, and the liberal arts curriculum, Addams feared stagnation, the divorce of knowledge from action, and a resulting lack of purpose among graduates and faculty. Addams's reputation, in her time and ours, suffered because of the devaluation of action; the perception that one who acted could not also think and reflect. As Lagemann points out in her analysis of the origins of academic sociology, women were side-lined in university life. The division of sociology into an academic discipline and the field of social work, with the former for men and the latter mostly for women, reflects turn of the century universities' obsession with separating the sexes, and their commitment to maintaining vocational segregation.

Patricia Smith Butcher's analysis of feminist periodicals reminds us of the social and political context for women's higher education in the years from the Civil War to World War II by linking the history of feminism, suffrage, and education. She found that access to higher education, graduate study, and professional opportunities remained key components of the women's rights program from the Seneca Falls Declaration of Sentiments (1848) through the granting of

suffrage in 1920. Historians of the women's movement have treated access to higher education as an end in itself, while historians of higher education have emphasized the disconnectedness between women's higher education and feminism. Butcher's work provides a much-needed corrective to these views. She points out that papers such as the *Woman's Journal* took seriously their function to bolster women's self-confidence and their morale as they entered the male-dominated world of higher education. Furthermore, higher education was a first step along the road to equality in all aspects of the human condition.

While women struggled to come to terms with higher education and its meaning in their lives, other outsiders had their own arrangements to consider. Lester F. Goodchild shows us how Catholics, particularly Jesuit higher education, in the Midwest, adapted to the era of standardization and the research university model. Ultimately, the distinctively Catholic curriculum gave way to one more calculated to win approval from both non-Catholic accreditors and Catholic students. Here again we see the critical relationship for minorities between curriculum and vocation. However, unlike the Protestant and evangelical women in Kerns's, Beatty's, and Lagemann's articles, Catholic men sought conformity as opposed to variety and uniqueness. Their assimilation into a society dominated by white Protestant males was less problematic than was the same process for women; thus the standard curriculum had much to offer them.

Evaluating the recent outpouring of scholarship related to Harvard's 350th birthday, Suzanne Hildenbrand's essay underscores the thematic concerns of educational historians. It is not enough, she says, merely to celebrate an institution's longevity and good name. Even historians of Harvard must answer questions about its place and impact on American life.



From: *The Croceus*, 1914 p. 47. The yearbook for the College For Women at the University of Rochester, Rochester, New York. Cover page introducing the Junior Class. Courtesy of Karl Kabelac, Librarian, Rare Books, Rush Rhees Library, University of Rochester.

Farmers' Daughters: The Education of Women at Alfred Academy and University Before the Civil War

KATHRYN M. KERNS

Alfred University

HIKING THROUGH THE WOODS of western New York State one suddenly comes upon evidence of farms long since reclaimed by nature—a rock pile where a field had once been cleared of its glacial boulders, remnants of an old fence, or fruit trees now returned to the wild. Areas that in the nineteenth century were part of an intricate pattern of farming communities now house wildlife, leaving only the very old and antiquarians to remember that these lands had once been cultivated. In much the same way, we have also forgotten the higher education that served the daughters, and the sons, of these farms.

In part this is due to a Whiggish approach to the history of higher education which has taken the modern university as the model and searched for its antecedents in the past. This perspective has limited our understanding of what education was like in the antebellum period—how it fit into those times and met the needs of young women and men, their families and their communities, as well as those of a nation in the process of westward expansion and growing industrialization. Until very recently much of the research on women's higher education has shared this perspective, leaving the impression that little education of any importance existed for women before the founding of Vassar in 1865. And much of the work that has been done on the antebellum period has concentrated on women's academies and seminaries in New England and the more developed areas of eastern New York State, with Oberlin standing out as the lone exception.¹

In the last decade or so, historians such as David Potts, Colin Burke, and James McLachlan have questioned the traditional view that the antebellum period marked the nadir of higher education in this country. They argue that the small antebellum colleges provided opportunities for a rising middle class and aided in the transition from rural to urban life. These studies have been fairly general and have not looked at women students or the question of coeducation; and, though they call for studies of other types of institutions, their research has been on colleges, while academies and normal schools probably offered more opportunities for women.²

To anyone schooled in the stratified, age-graded educational system of the twentieth century, antebellum higher education seems chaotic and unstructured. It featured a wide variety of institutions offering education beyond the common school—institutions such as colleges, academies, seminaries, normal schools, and various technical and professional schools. The distinction between secondary and higher education was not at all clear. Many academies offered collegiate-level courses and might as easily have been called colleges, while most colleges had large preparatory departments. And either might offer teacher training. For example, before the Civil War Alfred Academy and University, a small coeducational school in western New York State, combined academy, normal school, and college. To try to separate them is an exercise in futility. But if we can somehow resist the temptation to try to sort this all out and equate it with familiar modern institutions, we may begin to see this system as one closely tied to local needs and providing educational opportunities for large segments of the population never reached by more elite colleges (for men) and finishing schools (for women). This paper will investigate Alfred as a microcosm of antebellum higher education to see how the goals and aims of the school interacted with those of the students to produce a group of alumnae who managed to combine marriage and careers.

In many ways nineteenth-century Alfred had more in common with a Midwestern village than an Eastern town. Hidden away in a narrow valley of the foothills of the Appalachian Mountains, in Allegany County in western New York, Alfred remained fairly small and agricultural. A group of Seventh-Day Baptists had settled there about 1807 founding the town and, in 1836, the school which would eventually grow into Alfred University. The Seventh-Day Baptists (not to be confused with the more widely-known Seventh-Day Adventists) had broken away from the Newport (Rhode Island) Baptist Church in 1671 over the question of the Saturday sabbath. Even more than other evangelical sects, the Seventh-Day Baptists centered their religion on individual interpretation of the Bible. There they found the rationale for their observance of the "true" sabbath. But to read and understand the Bible children needed an education which meant that teachers were needed—preferably SDB teachers. Seventh-Day Baptists also shared Catharine Beecher's fear that the lack of teachers in the Midwest would cause that region to come under the influence of Catholicism. Citing this concern the Education Committee urged the 1838 General Conference to "earnestly entreat that many of our young brethren and sisters may become qualified for teaching."¹

Other Protestant denominations also voiced concern about education, but in most colleges the training of ministers remained of paramount importance. The Seventh-Day Baptists were more ambivalent about the value of an educated clergy. There were still some church members who viewed classical education as

"hostile not only to the spirit, but also to the principles of religion. . . ." So it was not until 1862 that Alfred University offered a theological class; and unlike other colleges, Alfred's primary mission remained training teachers of both sexes for the first few decades of its existence. This emphasis had important implications for the form that women's education took at Alfred before the Civil War. No denomination or school that we know of in this period was actively recruiting and training women to be ministers. If the training of ministers were the primary mission of a college, it followed that women would be second-class citizens there; however, if teacher training were of foremost importance, the possibility existed that women would be treated equitably.

This emphasis on the importance of teacher education reflected not only the religious beliefs of the Seventh-Day Baptists but also a secular belief in the power of education that was pervasive in the United States before the Civil War. The Jacksonian America of Alfred University's early years was a nation in transition. Growing industrialization was changing the nature and site of work. Urbanization, immigration, and westernization further threatened traditional beliefs and local sources of power. Widespread public education became one solution for the all these problems. The rise of the common school movement in the first half of the nineteenth century created a great demand for teachers, especially women teachers who could be paid much less than men. "By 1850, two million school age children required two hundred thousand teachers, nearly 90 percent of whom were women."⁴ At the same time the movement provided an ideology and rhetoric on the importance of education in improving society that could be used to plead the cause of higher education for women.

The education that Alfred offered must be viewed in the context of ongoing debates about how best to educate women. Many, such as Emma Willard, Mary Lyon, and Catharine Beecher, argued that women's education should be separate and different from men's, that women had special needs which could not be met in an education designed by and for men. This line of argument led to the founding of female seminaries which attempted to train women to be wives, mothers, and school teachers. Though they sought to enlarge the scope of woman's sphere, they never seriously challenged the concept of separate spheres. There are at least two ways of viewing this. One, is to argue, as Keith Melder does, that "by providing education separate from and unequal to that of men," the seminaries "confirmed and reinforced a double standard of education."⁶ Another is Anne Firor Scott's in looking at Emma Willard's Troy Female Seminary. Scott contends that women who held some attachment to traditional values could be more successful in putting forth feminist ideas because they were viewed as less threatening. In fact, nearly all of the early feminists in this country upheld the idea of woman's special sphere while

expanding it to include most activities. "Like many individuals, Troy as an institution combined an allegiance to certain well-defined ideas about what was proper for women, with a subversive attention to women's intellectual development."

A few women, like Caroline Dall, believed that women's education should not differ from men's. Dall argued that "all educational institutions should be kept open for her; that she should be encouraged to avail herself of these according to her own inclination; and that, so far as possible, she should pursue her studies, and test her powers in company with man."⁸ Coeducation can be defined in various ways. It can mean educating women and men together in an identical way, which generally means the way designed for men, or it can mean educating women and men at the same institution but not necessarily in the same way. The education that Alfred offered women before the Civil War reflected both the seminary founders' belief in a separate but equally important sphere for women, while at the same time providing equal access to classes in all subjects.

We know very little about the education the select school provided, but when William C. Kenyon arrived to take charge of it in 1839, he found that he was expected to teach "Geography, Grammar, Arithmetic, Algebra, Surveying, Book-keeping, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Botany, Astronomy, Zoology, Geology, Mental and Moral Philosophy, besides Latin, Greek, etc. . . ."⁹ Four years later when New York State officially incorporated the school as an academy, it still offered most of these subjects, with two female and two male instructors assisting Kenyon in running the school.

The three-year Teacher's Course which expanded to four years in 1850, was the only full course of instruction offered by the academy in its early years. By 1845 Alfred Academy could boast of having "sent out not less than one hundred and fifty teachers annually for the two past years, a number much larger than from any other institution in the State."¹⁰ The Teacher's Course provided a great deal of flexibility in subjects. Women could substitute a modern language for the Latin required of men students. There were also various electives and for a short time (from 1854 to 1856) students could choose to study the legal rights of woman. In addition the school offered several partial courses in a variety of subjects including instrumental music, drawing, and painting for women.

Although teacher training remained the primary mission of the academy, it did recognize a demand for college preparation and by 1852 offered classes designed to cover the first two years of a college classical course. When, in 1857, the New York State legislature awarded Alfred a university charter, the school offered three parallel collegiate courses: the Classical, the Scientific, and the Ladies Course, "arranged to meet the growing demand for a higher standard of female education . . . to harmoniously blend thorough intellectual discipline with

the cultivation of a refined and elegant taste, high moral principles, and pure religious sentiments."¹¹

A comparison of the Ladies Course with the other two collegiate courses shows that it contained less mathematics than the Scientific but more than the Classical. The Ladies Course had more literature and modern language than either of the other courses; and while they included surveying, it offered perspective drawing. Both the Scientific and the Ladies Courses contained much less instruction in the ancient languages, though these could be substituted for the modern ones prescribed in the courses. The student records show that about half of the alumnae took Latin, several took Greek, and a few followed the Classical Course. There were only a few upper-level Greek and science classes which apparently no woman took, but then only a handful of men did; while the only classes that none of the male graduates took were instrumental music, Italian, and presumably drawing.

Alfred's first president, William C. Kenyon (1857-1867), had studied at Union College, which had instituted the rather radical though successful, curricular reform of offering parallel courses in the classics and science. The reform's radicalism stemmed from the equality accorded to the classical and scientific degrees. Alfred took this one step further by declaring that the Ladies Course was equivalent to both the Scientific and the Classical Courses. However, Alfred's faculty found it inappropriate to call a woman a "bachelor," so it created the Laureate of Arts which was given to a woman no matter which course she followed. At Oberlin, the Ladies Course was clearly viewed as inferior to the Classical; women completing it received diplomas—not degrees—which were presented in a separate ceremony. The women who gave Oberlin its place as the pioneer in coeducation did so by disregarding all advice and taking the Classical Course designed for men. This approach to women's education reflects Oberlin's primary mission of training ministers and proper wives for those ministers.¹²

At Alfred University the emphasis on teacher training continued with most students of either sex taking the three-year English or Teacher's Course "arranged for those who, while not intending to complete either of the longer Courses, yet are desirous of preparing for teachers, or for efficient laborers and influential members of society."¹³ This course started off approximately one term behind, but contained many of the same subjects as, the three longer courses. Its third year was nearly identical to the senior year in the others, with the addition of a special class in didactics. It lacked literature, multiple foreign languages (a student could study Latin, Greek, or a modern language), higher mathematics and sciences, as well as most of the advanced classical subjects. Those who completed this course received a Bachelor or Laureate of Philosophy (rather than Arts).

Of the 108 degrees awarded at Alfred University between 1859 (when the first collegiate degree was granted) and 1865, 69 were for the Teachers' Course (of which 40 went to women), 7 were for the Classical, 13 for the Scientific Course, and 19 were for the Ladies Course (including the women who had followed the Classical Course). In 1862 Alfred University's trustees passed a resolution giving those who had graduated from Alfred Academy before 1857 a Bachelor or Laureate of Philosophy. No explanation is extant for why all women taking a longer course were listed in the catalog under the Ladies Course no matter what their studies. The courses were flexible enough to allow a woman to take whatever she liked (as could a male student). This practice seems to reflect a recognition of woman's separate but equal sphere at a time when women were defined primarily by their gender, but it also reflects an expansion of that sphere, much like early feminists, to include anything a woman wished to do.

Of equal, if not greater, importance than their studies for many students was the self-culture they gained in their student literary societies which dominated student life at Alfred as elsewhere in the nineteenth century and provided an important supplement to the school's curriculum. After early experiments first with single-sex then with coeducational societies, the women formed their own Ladies Literary Society in 1850. Writing many years later, Abigail Maxson Allen, an early Alfred student and teacher, recalls that though the early coeducational societies had "contained about equal members of young men and women, yet the young men did most of the public speaking."¹⁴ Eventually, there were two male and two female literary societies (or lyceums as they were also called). In terms of stated objectives, there were no major differences between the women's and men's lyceums at Alfred. These objectives echoed those of most student societies at that time and stressed self-improvement. One important function of the lyceums was to bring speakers to campus. Often several or all of the lyceums would pool their resources to bring an impressive array of speakers to town, including such reformers as Frederick Douglass (abolitionist), Thomas Beecher (clergyman), Gerrit Smith (philanthropist), Joshua R. Giddings (abolitionist), Orson Fowler (phrenologist), and Elihu Burritt (pacifist).

The most important part of the lyceum's weekly meetings was the debate. Differences appear in the types of questions debated. There was a much stronger emphasis in the male debates on questions of law and politics, though the women did not totally abandon these fields. They did not discuss questions connected with commerce such as protective tariffs or internal improvements. They spent much more time than the men debating philosophical and moral questions—questions of truth, right, duty, justice, beauty, and the roots of evil. In the area of education, men and women discussed many of the same questions. Predictably, the women spent more time than the men discussing questions about women's

education, but the men, too, affirmed the benefits of coeducation and a woman's right to equal access to education. The cult of domesticity clearly gave women dominion over culture and morality, while men were left in charge of the public worlds of business and politics. Yet, with the exception of commerce, Alfred women debated all of the topics debated by men.

In the lyceums women practiced their skills in oratory and debate with the support of their "sisters." The confidence thus gained in their private meetings allowed women to hold their own in public programs and debates with men. When a women's and a men's lyceum collaborated to present a joint program, which usually took place at least once a year, members from each group participated equally. The public sessions, both with and without the participation of men, provided women with important practice in speaking before large promiscuous, or mixed, audiences sometimes numbering a thousand or more.

Still, the right of women to speak in public was not universally recognized in this period. Oberlin refused to allow those women who graduated from the classical course to read their essays at commencement ceremonies as male graduates did for fear of appearing too radical.¹⁶ Oberlin's women students protested this treatment, and feminist Lucy Stone even refused to write a paper since she would not be allowed to read it. Jonathan Allen, an important Alfred teacher and later the University's second president, was a student at Oberlin when Stone made her protest. His wife relates that when asked how Alfred handled this question, Allen replied, "The most natural way in the world. If a young woman is capable of writing a paper, she ought to be able to read it."¹⁶

This reply sums up nicely the matter-of-fact way in which women's public speaking was treated at Alfred. From the very first, women students participated in anniversary exercises, with the primary differences being that while men generally gave orations, women read their essays. However, by 1854 some women were choosing to give orations which a local paper noted as "a sign of the progressive tendencies of the age."¹⁷ In part the general acceptance of women speaking in public in Alfred may have been due to the strong Seventh-Day Baptist interest in such reforms as abolition and temperance. At the 1850 anniversary dinner a local minister gave the following (non-alcoholic) toast: to the "Ladies of our Literary Institutions—May they ever spurn the rule of fashion, and be true and zealous reformers."¹⁸ To do this women had to be able to speak out in a good cause. It was only after the Civil War that Alfred women began to speak out about their own political rights, giving rise to some controversy at first.

This then was the education awaiting women who attended Alfred before the Civil War: the curriculum designed by the institution and the self-culture the students provided for themselves. A belief in separate but equally valued and overlapping spheres characterized both. But just which women did Alfred attract?

And why did they choose to come or their parents decide to send them?

From 1848 to 1861, women made up over 40% of the total student body at Alfred, and they were fairly evenly distributed throughout the various levels of instruction within the academy and university. Approximately 70% of these women came from Allegany County with 20% coming from the town of Alfred itself. Steuben County, whose border is only a few miles from Alfred, supplied another 15%. A somewhat greater proportion of the men came from distant towns. It seems to have been more acceptable for men to travel greater distances in search of an education than it was for women. Still, over half of the men came from Allegany County.

David Potts quotes a midwestern newspaperman who observed, "Men with their thousands can send their sons where they please; but men with only their hundreds must have a place near home, and where expenses will be at least reasonable."¹⁹ If this was true for sons, such considerations were even more important for daughters. Many of the local students could live at home, while for others the trip home to help out on the farm when needed remained a possibility. Attendance at the school was easier and required less of a real commitment; local students might even start by taking one or two courses in special subjects to see how they liked it. They were also more likely to have friends already attending the school. Some of these considerations are evident in a letter written by Esther Euphemia Potter who lived in Almond, some 6 miles north of Alfred. About 1845, she wrote her aunt,

Sally Stillman is attending school at the Academy. There is rising of a hundred students this term. I think some of attending in the winter. I think likely if I do I shall for one study take drawing as I did last winter." [periods added]²⁰

She went on to graduate in 1851, married the following year, then came back as a resident graduate in 1856. (She did not have her first child until 1866 when she was 34.)

Many of the remaining students came from nearby counties in the Southern Tier of New York and the northern border of Pennsylvania. For these students the decision had to be weighed more carefully. Minnie Reynolds, who came to Alfred in the fall of 1858 had first considered Genesee College, a Methodist Episcopal college in Lima, N.Y. where her brother had gone, but as she later explained,

At that time ladies were not admitted [to Genesee College] on an equality with the gentlemen and I would not go. Through an

Alfred graduate, I had formed an opinion that Alfred offered the best opportunities to ladies, better than any other school at that time . . .²¹

The tendency for the more distant students to be somewhat older than local students at matriculation is an indication of the greater degree of commitment generally required of the former. Also, there is a slight correlation (Kendall's tau of .14203, significant at the .005 level) between the distance of a student's home from Alfred and the likelihood that she would graduate.

Yet another important source of students for Alfred, the only SDB college at this time, were the Seventh-Day Baptist communities in Rhode Island, New Jersey, (West) Virginia, and Wisconsin that had important religious and family ties with Alfred. A few SDB families, like that of Thomas Williams, even moved to Alfred so that their daughters and sons could be educated.²²

Transportation was another important consideration. Until the railroad reached Alfred in 1851, the trip to Alfred was not an easy one. When James Irish came to teach in November 1837, he described his trip as "a night ride on an engine facing a snowstorm to Utica, a trip on a canal boat amid ice blockades and delays to Geneva, a ride in a lumber wagon to Almond, thence afoot in snow, mud, and fog to Alfred."²³ The number of students coming from more distant areas did increase with the coming of the railroad. The women coming the furthest to study at Alfred were two women who came in the early fifties from Haiti where the Seventh-Day Baptists had a missionary. One of these women was the first black student at Alfred. Both women may well have been black, but after the first no mention was made of the race of subsequent students.²⁴ There were also at least two Native American women from the Allegany Indian Reservation in nearby Cattaraugus county.

Alfred University prided itself on educating a broad middle class—"the working classes" as President Jonathan Allen (1867-1892) later described them—rather than an elite.²⁵ To test this assertion I used a sample consisting of all the women who had attended the school at any level between 1848 and 1861 and then had gone on to graduate, matched by a like number randomly selected from those who did not graduate, for a total sample of 298 students, or roughly 20% of the women attending Alfred at this time. Of these, I located the families of 183, or nearly two-thirds, in the 1850 census. To examine possible differences between the backgrounds of those who graduated and those who did not, I ran the information for these groups separately and compared them. In most cases there were few differences between the two groups, and those that did exist were not highly significant.

Judging from the measures of family wealth recorded in the 1850 census, most of Alfred's women students belonged to a middle-income group. None were from extremely wealthy families. Nearly three-quarters came from families owning \$3000 or less in real estate as compared to just over half of the students at Mount Holyoke which also sought to draw upon middle-income families in this period. A few Alfred women came from families with little or no real estate. Both the school and the Seventh-Day Baptists provided financial assistance and scholarships for needy students of both sexes.

Approximately three-quarters of the women came from farm families. Home production of cloth in New York State declined dramatically before the Civil War, giving farm girls a chance to consider doing other things with their time—things like going to school. Still, there is no evidence that these women were the superfluous daughters no longer needed at home that David Allmendinger found at Mount Holyoke.²⁶ Most came from areas where dairy production remained an important part of the farm economy and had not yet been industrialized. Farm production of cheese and butter continued to be high, with nearly every farm producing butter for market.

A problem with Allmendinger's study of Mount Holyoke is that he does not compare the families who sent daughters with those that might have but did not. To make such a comparison for Alfred, I used the 1855 New York State census, one of the richest sources of socioeconomic data from this period, and a sample consisting of all the families living in the town of Alfred that had at least one unmarried daughter in the age range of 9 to 20 living at home when that census was taken.²⁷ Of the 115 families that met this criterion, 57 had sent at least one daughter to Alfred while 58 had not. In most respects, including family size and composition, the families that sent daughters to Alfred were remarkably similar to those that did not. In one respect they were markedly different and that was in terms of wealth. This was most pronounced in the value of dwellings. Although one family in the non-sending group had a house valued at as much as \$900, 62% of these families lived in houses valued at \$150 or less, while this was true for only 6% of the families who sent daughters to Alfred. Differences in wealth also appear in the value of farms and farm equipment. In almost all areas of production of goods involving women's labor, the families sending daughters to Alfred tended to produce more than those that did not.

Some scholars, including Allmendinger and Kathryn Sklar, have argued that the declining availability of land and a change in the roles played by young women on the family farm were instrumental in the decision to send them on for further education.²⁸ The evidence for Alfred is mixed. Land was still available in the area, and rather than declining in value, the mean value of farms increased from \$1361 in 1850 to \$2305 in 1860. The decline of domestic production of

cloth was partially offset by the dominance of dairy production and thus had less of an impact in the areas supplying most of Alfred's students than it did in New England farms sending students to Mount Holyoke. There are limits to what a sample from a single town can tell us; however, in Alfred at least, it seems that the desire of families to educate their daughters or of the daughters to educate themselves was fairly universal and that some families were prohibited only by poverty. Although the school offered scholarships and work opportunities to poor students, it could not replace the value of a daughter's lost labor which must be considered as part of the cost of education. Daughters from many of the poorest families had to be satisfied with the education the district school provided.

Life on the farm included separate spheres for women and men, but these spheres were permeable because of the nature and demands of the work, and women's work still had highly visible economic value. This meant that mothers might take an active role in seeing that their daughters went to school. When Mary Ann Sheldon wanted to attend Alfred Academy, it was her mother who decided she could spare enough butter for the tuition (and presumably also her daughter's time), while Mary Ann's father supplied enough grain to pay for the rest of her expenses.²⁹ After only a term at Alfred Academy, Sheldon got a job teaching in a district school and made enough money to give her father the \$10 he needed to pay his taxes and still have \$3 left for herself, a rather quick return on her parents' investment. But she continued to combine teaching and going to school until in 1849, ten years after she began, she graduated from Alfred Academy with a teaching degree.

Sheldon wrote that she decided to attend the academy after listening to its new teacher, William C. Kenyon, speak at the school's year-end exercises on "the advantages of education preparatory to meeting the responsibilities of life."³⁰ Kenyon actively promoted the common school movement, and later Alfred teachers also stressed the importance of teaching as a calling. Women students seem to have shared the school's belief in the importance of religion and education. And the fact that educating a daughter could be seen as a way to augment the family income or prepare her to support herself if necessary must have added to its attraction to both parents and daughters. However, a woman did not need a degree in teaching to get a job or even to have a career as a teacher as is evident from looking at the teaching careers of women who were among the 90% of Alfred students who never graduated. (The percentage of men who did not graduate was roughly the same as that for women, but some of them may have gone on to other schools while few, if any, of the women did.) For some women education was more than a way to prepare oneself for a vocation. Women students at Alfred spoke of a love for learning, developing their "God given

powers of mind," and the importance of education, echoing their teachers who spoke to an audience of both women and men.⁵¹ There is no evidence of the "planning," which "encompassed everything from details of daily routine to schemes for staging entire lifetimes," that Allmendinger found in the language of the Holyoke students, echoing their teacher, Mary Lyon.⁵² Very likely women came to Alfred for a variety of reasons, including economic, religious, vocational, and educational considerations.

Some historians have argued that the antebellum colleges sponsored "social mobility to a degree as great as in any period of American history before the post-World War II era" and moved "students from old to new cultures and environments."⁵³ By this they generally mean male students. What function did antebellum higher education serve for women?

For Allmendinger the answer is fairly straightforward: economic and demographic changes had disrupted women's traditional pattern of living at home until an early marriage. "Teaching, and preparation for teaching, replaced early marriage in the female life cycle, without displacing marriage in the female life *career*." Looking at Mount Holyoke students, he found that they "were seeking traditional life courses." Although 19% never married (in contrast to 6 to 8% of women in the general population), he asserted that this figure is comparable to that for Troy students and for Boston women. Most of the Holyoke graduates (82.5%) taught school, but of those who married, only 7% ever taught again. "Marriage returned these women to traditional life careers from which their unconventional life cycles momentarily had veered."⁵⁴ Women's true career was marriage, and teaching provided a means of occupying her time and contributing to the family income or supporting herself until she could find a husband. However, Allmendinger does concede that while Mount Holyoke helped conserve the traditional life cycle for women, it also altered "their experience, their associations, their life chances, and their mentality," but he does not elaborate on this, nor does he discuss what the 17.5% who did not teach did.

Scott employs a different perspective in her study of Troy Female Seminary. While Allmendinger looks for evidence of continuity, she searches for evidence of change. She finds that "while one of Emma Willard's avowed goals was to make better wives and mothers, her pupils were less likely to marry than women in general and, if married, they bore fewer children than their contemporaries."⁵⁵ The number who remained single in the antebellum period varied from a low of 13% in the 1820s to a high of 21% in the 1850s. Scott does not present information on the socioeconomic backgrounds of her students, but since it cost women more than twice as much to attend Troy as it did Mount Holyoke or Alfred, it is likely that Troy women came from more elite families. This could help explain why only 26% of the women reported working for pay at any

time in their lives, though some of them were engaged in a variety of interesting pursuits from farming and geology to medicine and missionary work. Scott contends that "despite their emphasis upon the importance of woman's sphere," the seminaries "were important agents in that development of a new self-perception and spread of feminist values which contemporary observers described as the 'great nineteenth century movement for the elevation of women.'"⁶ Though there are difficulties involved in comparing Allmendinger's statistics with Scott's since they are based on different sources of information, it is clear that Troy and Holyoke women married at the same rate (about 80%) and only a small fraction of these (about 6%) worked after marriage. For most of these women, being a wife and mother was apparently their primary or sole career.

Of the Alfred alumnae from 1848 to 1861, at least 81.2% married, but unlike Troy and Holyoke alumnae at least a third of Alfred's married women graduates worked after marriage. Information on the careers of Alfred women was culled from the SDB and student newspapers, alumni reports, genealogies, and reminiscences. Since such sources are likely to report the activities of achieving women, the statistics given here are deliberately conservative and assume that none of the third of the married women for whom no information is available worked. Therefore, the true figure of those who worked after marriage could be as high as two third. This is similar to Rita Saslaw's findings for Oberlin alumnae for this period. Saslaw estimates "that somewhere between thirty to sixty percent" of the Oberlin alumnae she studied "had active occupations during marriage."⁷

A large majority of Alfred alumnae taught for at least some part of their careers. This is hardly suprising given the demand for teachers and Alfred's stress on the importance of education. However, most of the women who continued to teach after marriage did so in private academies, seminaries, or small colleges—both coeducational and women's. Many of the public schools may have had regulations that did not permit married women to teach, but it is also seems likely that private schools offered women the flexibility needed to combine marriage and a career.

Another 7%, or just half as many women as men, went on from Alfred to become doctors. One woman entered medicine to support her family after her husband died. Another, Pheobe Babcock Wait, managed to juggle a very active medical career, which included serving as dean of the New York Women's Medical College, with raising six children (a seventh having died in infancy). Dr. Wait encouraged women to become physicians because she believed it to be the only profession where they could receive "equal compensation with men," but she was also concerned about the question of marriage and its effect on the career of a woman doctor. She saw no reason for a woman physician to remain single,

and she insisted that it was the height of folly for a woman to abandon her practice upon marriage. She urged her students to make their professions as inseparable from their lives as a husband or child, but she also warned them, "Your family relations are a part of your inheritance from the All-Father, and no duties which you may assume could justify you in ignoring them."⁸ However, other than eschewing society, she offered little advice on how to manage all this, nor did she describe how she had done so. Her husband was "sympathetic," and it seems likely that she had servants. She may also have been able to draw upon a network of family and friends.

A few women became missionaries, but they remained single. Dr. Ella F. Swinney went to China as a medical missionary where her practice included thousands of men, women, and children. Other women went as teachers to Africa or to freedmen's schools in the south.

Several women joined their husbands in running businesses including schools, a general store, a Swedish Movement Cure sanatorium in New York City, and a publishing house. In addition, many of the married women who taught did so at the same institutions as their husbands. Only a few women became farm wives. Alfred seems to have played much the same role for young women that the antebellum college played for young men, aiding in the transition from rural to urban life and moving women from farms into careers, though for them the range of available occupations was more limited. Still, the period of transition before the Civil War seems to have offered women new opportunities, and institutions of higher education seem to have played an important role in the decisions women made about these.

A definitive statement on the exact nature of this influence awaits further research into the various forms higher education for women took in the antebellum period. However, some possibilities can be suggested for Alfred.

Allmendinger and Sklar's argument about the role the decline of farms had in the decision of New England families to send their daughters to Mount Holyoke is an intriguing one, but not one that applies to all schools. The Midwest, where coeducational institutions were more prevalent, had abundant and rich farmland. Industrialization was undoubtedly having an impact, but that impact varied with region and industry. In New England where the manufacture of textiles was fairly advanced and had supplanted an important farm industry, the effects were greater than in the Midwest where farms concentrated on food production or much of New York State where dairy production was predominant. New York and Midwestern farms would be affected by decreased domestic textile production, but not to the same extent as New England farms. The great majority of Alfred's students came from farms where women's work still played an important part in the farm economy. Daughters coming from such farms would

be much more likely to view the family as a production unit and work as compatible with marriage, even after their schooling had taught them to strive for careers beyond the farm.

Another important factor that helped determine the shape that a woman's education might take or what she looked for in it was religion. Sklar contends that "religious commitment allowed young women to resist the 'family claim' on their services and greatly facilitated their entrance into the larger world of social service."³⁹ Like most antebellum colleges, Alfred maintained close ties with a religious group, but it was not sectarian. It made a point of welcoming students of all faiths. When Julia Ward Howe visited in 1871 she found, "The Sabbatarian confession of faith though always recognized and maintained at the college, is not made a *sine qua non* with the pupils, many of whom are like the rest of us first-day people."⁴⁰ The problem comes in trying to discover just how many "many" was. The few ministers who sent their daughters to Alfred were all from evangelical churches, but one large Episcopalian family sent all its daughters. Some students (both Seventh-Day Baptists and non SDBs) certainly saw education as a missionary effort. And whatever the actual number of students coming from Seventh-Day Baptist families, that denomination had an important impact on the school in stressing the importance of teaching and reform work as well as women's vital role in each.

Holyoke women also viewed education as a missionary effort, but the two schools differ in the emphasis placed on a woman's role as wife and mother. Alfred was training future teachers of both sexes in classes that were coeducational. There, students were told that teaching was an important career through which a person could influence others and help to shape society; it was not merely a job to occupy one's time until the more important role of wife and mother came along. Also the students had role models in the married women teachers at the school. These women taught mostly in areas that could be considered women's spheres, but they were visible on campus and were often combining the roles of teacher, wife, and mother.

Also important in coeducational institutions were the relationships that sprang up between male and female students. At Alfred men and women competed against each other in the classroom and cooperated in some of their lyceum productions. Fourteen percent of all the married alumnae married classmates, and in those cases where some information is known about their lives after marriage (there is no information on three and a fourth died shortly after marriage), nearly all worked, and the few who did not work outside the home seem to have helped their doctor or minister husbands. All of the women worked with their husbands. Many taught in the same schools as their spouses, but one joined her husband in editing a newspaper, while another ran a store with hers,

and a third studied law with her lawyer husband. This is not to say that these were all equal partnerships, but in each case the woman was involved in the same work world as her husband.

It is not clear to what extent the coeducational nature of Oberlin and Alfred is responsible for the greater percentage of alumnae who continued to work after marriage. Oberlin and Alfred shared other features such as student bodies from similar socioeconomic and geographic settings, as well as evangelical religions which, though very different, did both include roles for women in reform. At the same time there were some real differences in the way women were treated at each school. Clearly, more research is needed on the ways each of these factors affected a woman's assessment of her options. However, it seems that by drawing on the older tradition of the family production unit and the new ideology of the importance of education, while relying on flexible working arrangements and important networks of support, many Alfred alumnae were able to combine marriage and a career. By studying schools like Alfred, we may expand our concepts of the education offered to women before the Civil War and the role higher education played in their lives.

NOTES

1. For an excellent summary of the history of women's higher education in the United States see Barbara Miller Solomon, *In the Company of Educated Women* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).
2. David B. Potts, "College Enthusiasm: A Public Response," *Harvard Educational Review*, 47 (February 1977), pp. 28-42; Colin B. Burke, *American Collegiate Populations: A Test of the Traditional View* (New York: New York University Press, 1983); and James McLachlan, "The American College in the Nineteenth Century: Toward a Reappraisal," *Teachers College Record*, 80 (December 1978), pp. 287-306.
3. Joan N. Burstyn, "Catherine Beecher and the Education of American Women," *New England Quarterly* 47 (September 1974), p. 395; and *Minutes of the Seventh-Day Baptist General Conference* (DeRuyter, NY: J & C H Maxson, 1838), pp. 8-9.
4. *Protestant Sentinel* 5 (March 30, 1835), p. 669.
5. Pamela Roby, "Women and American Higher Education," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 404 (November 1972), p. 122.
6. Keith E. Melder, *Beginnings of Sisterhood* (New York: Schocken Books, 1977), p. 23.
7. Anne Firor Scott, "The Ever Widening Circle: The Diffusion of Feminist Values from the Troy Female Seminary, 1822-1872," *History of Education Quarterly* 19 (Spring 1979), pp. 4-5. For

a discussion of early feminists' concepts of separate spheres, see Blanche Glassman Hersh, *The Slavery of Sex* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978).

8. Caroline H. Dall, *The College, the Market, and the Court* (New York: Arno Press, 1972; originally Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1867), p. 6.
9. Letter from W. C. Kenyon (April 3, 1839) reprinted in *Alfred Student* 3 (April, 1876), p. 77.
10. *Alfred Academy Catalog*, 1844, p. 16.
11. *Alfred Academy and University Catalog*, 1859, p. 29.
12. James H. Fairchild, *Oberlin: The Colony and the College* (Oberlin, Ohio: E. J. Goodrich, 1883); Frances Juliette Hosford, *Father Shepherd's Magna Charta: A Century of Coeducation in Oberlin College* (Boston: Marshall Jones Co., 1937); and Robert S. Fletcher, "The First Coeds," *American Scholar* 7 (Winter 1938), pp. 78-93.
13. *Alfred Academy and University Catalog*, 1860, p. 30.
14. Abigail A. Allen, *Life and Sermons of Jonathan Allen* (Oakland, Calif.: Pacific Press Publishing, 1894), p. 46.
15. Hosford, p. 82.
16. Allen, p. 52.
17. *Hornesville Tribune*, (July 13, 1854), p. [2].
18. *Sabbath Recorder*, (July 25, 1850), p. 21.
19. Potts, p. 38.
20. Esther Euphemia Potter to her aunt, circa 1845, Special Collections Room, Herrick Memorial Library, Alfred University.
21. Newspaper clipping of letter from Minnie Reynolds Barlow, source and date unknown, Special Collections Room, HML.
22. Letter from W. Williams to Prof. Tomlinson, Sept. 1, 1907, Special Collections Room, HML.
23. James Irish quoted in Allen, p. 378.
24. T. Dwight Thacher, "Thirty Years Out of School" (Topeka: Kansas Publishing House, 1886), pp. 4-5.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 385.
26. David F. Allmendinger, "Mount Holyoke Students Encounter the Need for Life-Planning, 1837-1850," *History of Education Quarterly* 19 (Spring 1979), pp. 27-46.
27. In New York State a town is the political entity into which counties are divided. The town of Alfred included several villages and the surrounding countryside.
28. Allmendinger, p. 28, and Kathryn Kish Sklar, "The Founding of Mount Holyoke College" in

Women of America, eds. Carol Ruth Berkin and Mary Beth Norton (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1979), pp. 177-198.

29. Mary A. Sheldon Powell, "A Few Reminiscences of My Early School Days," typescript copy in Spec. Coll. Rm., HML.
30. Ibid.
31. Hannah Simpson, *Diary*, Feb. 9, 1861, Spec. Coll. Rm., HML.
32. Allmendinger, pp. 27-46.
33. Burke, pp. 96-97.
34. Allmendinger, p. 40.
35. Scott, p. 17.
36. Scott, p. 19.
37. Rita S. Saslaw, "Conflict of Roles: Evangelism and Feminism—A Twentieth Century Perspective?" History of Education Society Meeting, Vancouver, BC, October 20, 1984, pp. 27-28.
38. *Sabbath Recorder* 48 (May 5, 1982), pp. 274-275.
39. Sklar, p. 192.
40. Julia Ward Howe, "An Idyl of Mid-Summer and Middle Ages," *Old and New* 4 (October 1871), pp. 448-449.

"The Kind of Knowledge of Most Worth to Young Women": Post-Secondary Vocational Training for Teaching and Motherhood at the Wheelock School, 1888-1914

BARBARA BEATTY

Wellesley College

IN HER 1975 ARTICLE "So Much to Do: Guides for Historical Research on Women in Higher Education," Patricia Albjerg Graham suggested that historians study the kinds of institutions most women in higher education attended, especially normal schools and teacher colleges.¹ More than a decade later we have learned a good deal about private, Eastern, women's liberal arts colleges and the lives of some of their exceptional faculty and graduates, but still know very little about the less elite colleges and vocational training schools at which the majority of women in post-secondary education studied and worked.

Why have historians overlooked these more typical kinds of women's vocational institutions?² Like women's historians generally, historians of women's higher education began by studying pathbreakers and pioneers, notable women and well-known institutions with substantial records and organized archives.³ More recently, social historians have concentrated on women from the laboring and lower classes whose access to higher education was limited, and on workers' education.⁴ But the education of the women in the middle, many of whom attended vocational institutions and worked in women's occupations, has been largely ignored.

Studies of nursing and social work include discussions of training, but surprisingly little scholarship has been devoted to teacher training, particularly as this was such a common form of post-secondary education for women.⁵ This oversight may have occurred in part because any education in liberal culture was considered preparation for teaching, thus most women who became teachers received no formal teacher training. But as the nineteenth century progressed, more specialized forms of teacher training developed in separate departments, training programs and normal schools. This specifically vocational education became the model for the large numbers of women interested in becoming teachers of younger children.⁶ This article briefly describes the history and curriculum of one of these new forms of specialized teacher education, the

private, post-secondary teacher training school for women founded in Boston in 1888 by Lucy Wheelock.

Examination of a teacher training institution such as the Wheelock School sheds light on the diversity of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century views on how women should be educated and what kinds of knowledge should be included in the curriculum, and underscores the continuity of vocationalism in women's education. Lucy Wheelock's ideas about women's education differed from those of the founders and faculty of the private women's liberal arts colleges established during the last third of the nineteenth century. As recent scholarship on the history of women's higher education documents, the educational ideals of the presidents and professors of the experiments in single-sex collegiate education for women varied as did the campuses. But there was unity in the attempt to prove women men's educational equals, and to provide them with an equal though not necessarily identical education.⁷ Unlike most presidents and professors of the private women's liberal arts colleges, Lucy Wheelock emphasized the dissimilarity of men and women, not their intellectual equality. While not opposed to liberal education for women, Wheelock argued that their educational needs differed from those of men, and criticized the liberal arts colleges for failing to educate women for their future roles as wives and mothers. In place of the disciplinary knowledge of the liberal arts curriculum, the "kind of knowledge" Wheelock thought was "of most worth to young women" was vocational training for teaching and motherhood.⁸

The life and career patterns of graduates of post-secondary institutions for women at the turn of the century were the source of heated controversy. Many of the first generation of women's liberal arts college graduates did not marry, and a number underwent personal crises after college.⁹ Though the reasons for these lowered marriage rates are complex and the data problematic, this tendency to remain single and the conflicts some college educated women experienced in meeting the claims of family and career suggest a loosening of the traditional linkage of gender, education, and vocation, a loosening which may have been in part a result of receiving a liberal education modeled after that provided to men. In contrast, Lucy Wheelock's prescription for women's education, like that of earlier American female educators Emma Willard, Catharine Beecher, and Mary Lyon, was explicitly gender-based.¹⁰ As late as 1914 Wheelock's answer to the "woman question" was still that women should be educated to be teachers and mothers. Teaching and mothering was what most Wheelock graduates did.

Given these differences in the types of post-secondary education open to women in late nineteenth and early twentieth-century America, and the likelihood that these differences affected the lives of graduates, we need to learn more about how young women came to attend particular institutions, and the speci-

ficity of the curricular and educational environment they encountered. Vocational self-selection and the timing of vocational decisions were important determinants in the college selection process. Ostensibly young women who attended the Wheelock School did so because they had already decided to become teachers. But whether the decision to become a teacher was a thoughtful one, and the extent to which it was influenced by socialization, family influences, and other factors, is impossible to determine.¹¹ By the mid-nineteenth century the extension of "woman's sphere" from home to school was so accepted and expected that a period of teaching may have been a more normal stage in the female life cycle between girlhood and marriage than a chosen occupation.¹² Yet for many young women the decision to become a teacher could be a first step toward independence, as evidenced by their desire for training, although they did not need it to obtain a teaching position in most states until well into the twentieth century. But the number of educated young women in late nineteenth-century New England was large, and the number of occupational opportunities for them was limited. Thus some training may have been advantageous in a crowded and competitive job market. The life and writings of Lucy Wheelock, and others like her, however, speak to the strong sense of commitment attracting women to teaching, and motivating them to seek teacher training regardless of the job market. This compelling desire of women to be teachers, a desire often experienced as a vocational calling, and the belief that teacher education provided preparation for motherhood, led to the success of this new kind of women's post-secondary education.¹³

Lucy Wheelock's Education and Vocation

Lucy Wheelock's life illustrates the impact vocational choice and commitment, and the timing of vocational decisions could have on women's education. The daughter of a Congregationalist minister, Lucy Wheelock was born in Cambridge, Vermont, on February 1, 1857.¹⁴ In addition to his pastoral duties her father, Edwin Wheelock, was superintendent of schools, a representative to the Vermont State Legislature and, for a period, a state senator. Her mother, Laura Pierce Wheelock, was active in church and missionary work and with the Women's Christian Temperance Union. Lucy Wheelock learned to read, write and count in a small dame school run by her mother, and was taught at home until the age of thirteen when, for a year, she attended Underhill Academy in Vermont. She then left her family and moved with a neighbor to Reading, Massachusetts, where she attended the public high school.

According to her autobiography, after graduating from high school in 1874, Wheelock wanted to enter Wellesley College. Much publicity surrounded the building of the model institution for women envisioned by Henry and Pauline Durant which opened to students in 1875. But Wheelock must have been aware of the Durants' intended entrance requirements, including "Latin Grammar, four books of Caesar, four books of Virgil, and four orations of Cicero," as she knew that her preparation at Reading High School was insufficient.¹⁵ To prepare for Wellesley, Wheelock applied to the Chauncy-Hall School in Boston, and made arrangements with the headmaster to keep the school's records in payment for her tuition. One of the few private coeducational schools in Boston, Chauncy-Hall had begun admitting girls, usually the sisters of boys in attendance, as early as 1858. The school attracted a small group of women students; some became important figures in the first generation of female college graduates.¹⁶ Among the young women at Chauncy-Hall in the mid 1870s while Lucy Wheelock studied there were Marion Talbot and Alice Stone Blackwell, both of whom went on to attend newly-founded Boston University. Though Wheelock did not mention knowing Talbot, later dean of women and assistant professor of sociology at the University of Chicago, and a leading researcher in the study of sex differences, she did become friendly with Alice Stone Blackwell, the daughter of Lucy Stone and Henry Browne Blackwell. Despite any differences Wheelock and Blackwell may have had over the role of women in American society—Alice Stone Blackwell became the editor of the *Woman's Journal*, the women's rights newspaper founded by her mother—they respected each other's chosen callings and remained close friends for life. In their correspondence, Blackwell praised Lucy Wheelock's efforts on behalf of future generations and wrote, after receipt of an honorary doctorate from Boston University in 1945, that Wheelock deserved "a doctorate of the Humanities" as much, if not more, than she did.¹⁷

By the end of a year at Chauncy-Hall Lucy Wheelock had completed college preparation requirements but, unlike Marion Talbot and Alice Stone Blackwell, she did not apply for admission to Wellesley or to any other college. She had decided instead to become a kindergarten teacher. Though teacher training was part of Wellesley's original mission and most of the college's early graduates who worked became teachers, Wellesley did not provide the kind of specialized kindergarten training courses Wheelock sought. In fact Wellesley offered no regular undergraduate courses in education until 1887-1888 when Carla Wencabaugh, a German professor who was president Alice Freeman's close friend, taught "The Science and the Art of Teaching," focusing on European pedagogy and the kindergarten. By this time, however, Lucy Wheelock had already begun her own kindergarten training program.¹⁸

An encounter with a kindergarten class at the Chauncy-Hall School changed Lucy Wheelock's mind about applying to Wellesley; a decision which affected the course of her life. As she wrote in her autobiography, "a brief visit one day . . . opened a door to me into the land of childhood, a place I desired to enter and where I have always loved to stay."¹⁹ From Wheelock's descriptions, her first encounter with a kindergarten was like a religious conversion experience. "It seemed to me," she is reported to have said, "the gates of heaven were open and I had a glimpse of the kingdom where peace and love reign . . . I had found my kingdom."²⁰ Borrowing from the canons of evangelicism to express the impact on adults of the discovery of the special nature of childhood and children was a common theme in the imagery of romanticism. Wheelock's mentor Elizabeth Peabody, a key figure in Boston's Romantic renaissance, experienced a similar transformation upon discovery of the kindergarten. Both women often compared becoming a kindergartner to religious conversion, and commented frequently on the immediate and powerful effects new kindergartners—this was what kindergarten teachers, not their pupils, were called—felt upon first exposure to the "redeeming vocation of childhood."²¹

For some young women, finding a vocation in teaching may have replaced a religious conversion experience. This explains the continued popularity of teaching, even after other occupations became open to women, as well as the extraordinary sense of dedication among many female teachers who viewed their work more as a sacred calling than a labor of childkeeping and instruction. The fervor with which Lucy Wheelock and so many other women in late nineteenth-century New England devoted themselves to child gardening was also a sign of the difficulty many women experienced in finding something meaningful, socially acceptable, and modestly remunerative to do with their lives.²² In a society with few employment opportunities for "true ladies," and in a region of the country where marriageable women outnumbered available men, kindergarten teaching provided an appropriately feminine, socially acceptable solution to the "woman question." At the same time, with its overtones of mysticism and German naturalistic philosophy, Friedrich Froebel's kindergarten pedagogy was particularly attractive to educated women who sought some special use for their education commensurate with their abilities. As Elizabeth Peabody, one of Froebel's first American converts put it, "kindergartning" was "a vocation from on High," the "highest finish" that could be given to a woman's education, "the perfect development of womanliness—a working with God at the very fountain of artistic and intellectual power and moral character."²³

The support of upper and middle-class women who became ardent Froebelians, kindergarten advocates, and teachers, was primarily responsible for the success of the kindergarten movement in the United States. First introduced

in the Midwest in the 1850s by liberal Germans who emigrated after the failure of the revolution of 1848, kindergartens became increasingly popular and widespread after 1860 when Elizabeth Peabody opened the first American English-speaking kindergarten in Boston. Charity kindergartens were established in the 1870s and 1880s, but real growth came with their adoption in public schools. Due to the influence of Elizabeth Peabody, kindergartens began in the St. Louis schools in 1873, under the supervision of William Torrey Harris. By the late 1890s most major American cities, including Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago, had public kindergartens. The institutionalization of the kindergarten in public education spawned numerous kindergarten training schools similar to the one Lucy Wheelock established in Boston.

Having found her vocation, Lucy Wheelock turned to Elizabeth Peabody for advice about how to become a kindergarten teacher. Peabody, devoting herself to the wider dissemination of Froebelianism through publication of a journal, the *Kindergarten Messenger*, recommended that Wheelock attend a training school run by Mrs. Ella Snelling Hatch. Peabody, who had run her own kindergarten training class for a time and had been influential in encouraging the development of Froebelian kindergarten training in America, listed seven one-woman training classes in Boston in an 1874 edition of her journal, including Mrs. Hatch's.²⁴ Peabody lectured there frequently, and at the end of the year-long course signed Wheelock's diploma.

Beginning of the Wheelock School

Upon completion of her kindergarten training in 1879, Lucy Wheelock returned to the Chauncy-Hall School where she taught a widely recognized kindergarten for ten years. Henry Barnard took an interest in her work, as did Robert Woods, the crusading social worker who established a kindergarten in his settlement house in Boston's South End. Wheelock also came under the influence of G. Stanley Hall. She attended summer sessions at Clark, and incorporated some of Hall's new psychological ideas into her modified Froebelian curriculum.²⁵

In 1888, the year that public kindergartens were permanently instituted in the Boston public schools, Thomas Cushing and William H. Ladd, principals of the Chauncy-Hall School, asked Wheelock to start a kindergarten training class. Her initial response was that she was "not equal to such a high calling," but Elizabeth Peabody, Henry Barnard, and others persuaded her to proceed with the venture.²⁶ The first class, which graduated in 1889, consisted of six students. By the second year twenty-one students were enrolled, and the number continued to increase. At first Wheelock limited the enrollment to sixty students, then to eighty, but

finally admitted as many candidates as she felt were qualified to become kindergartners.

Unlike her own experience preparing for Wellesley twenty years earlier, applicants seeking admission to Lucy Wheelock's kindergarten training class met with few academic barriers. Personal characteristics were deemed as, if not more, important than academic qualifications in teacher candidates. Admissions requirements stated in an 1894 brochure were "an ability to sing, good health, a love of children, and a high-school education or its equivalent, and broad general culture." Applicants were to "furnish testimonials as to scholarship and moral character from the principal of the school last attended, or from some clergyman of their town, and must be at least eighteen years of age."²⁷ Nor was the tuition as high as that at Wellesley (\$150 plus an additional \$200 for room and board). The tuition of Lucy Wheelock's kindergarten class was \$100 for the first year and \$75 for the second, not including books and materials at an additional \$15. But though lower than Wellesley by a third, \$100 was not a negligible sum in 1894, especially as kindergarten training was available in many tuition-free state normal schools.²⁸

By 1895 a second year had been added to the one-year course, and in 1896 Lucy Wheelock assumed full control, moving the training class out of the Chauncy-Hall School. In 1904 the program moved again, to another location in Boston's Back Bay, and in 1914 a new campus was built on the Riverway. In 1939 when Wheelock retired, more than three hundred and fifty students were enrolled. The school was incorporated, a Board of Trustees appointed, and in 1941 the Wheelock School became a chartered college.²⁹

Curriculum for Vocational Education

The Wheelock School provided a new kind of post-secondary education for women. An outgrowth of the crusade for kindergartens, and the larger social and cultural movements for early childhood education and child welfare culminating in the reforms of the Progressive Era, the curriculum was child- rather than subject-centered. Unlike earlier female seminaries which prepared young women to teach older students through instruction in the classics and other school subjects, and heavy doses of religious education, the curriculum of the Wheelock School focused on young children and practical teaching methods. Education in the subject matter of the disciplines required for teaching older students was not offered. Instead, Lucy Wheelock developed a unique child-oriented curriculum based on Froebelian pedagogy and child study. Students at the Wheelock School learned methods for educating young children by actually participating in the activities they were being taught to teach. Lucy Wheelock

thought young women needed this kind of practical knowledge about young children and education, and she provided it to students at her kindergarten training school.

From a description in an 1894 brochure, the two-year curriculum followed by young women enrolled in Lucy Wheelock's kindergarten training class consisted of first year courses on kindergarten methods, child study and applied psychology, including Froebel's gifts and occupations, kindergarten songs and games, and music. In addition students did morning observations in kindergartens. Second year courses included "Survey of History of Pedagogy," "Applications of Pedagogic Principles," and "Psychology in Teaching." "Science—work adapted for use in the kindergarten," seasonal programs for children, and primary methods, along with more work on Froebelian gifts and occupations, observation, music and story telling, including the "study of myths, fairy tales, stories of history and biography, and science."³⁰ As the enrollment increased the classes became larger, but much of the instruction consisted of "hands on" activities. Students played games, sang songs, and did Froebelian handwork as if they themselves were children. They also student taught in real kindergartens where they served as teacher assistants and helpers. Aspects of the campus environment and experiences available to students at the Wheelock School complemented the curriculum as well. For instance Froebel's birthday was honored with an annual ceremony, and his bust decorated with garlands of flowers. In 1911 Lucy Wheelock organized a Froebel Pilgrimage, a trip to Germany and visit to Froebel's birthplace, accompanied by some of her students.

In addition to course work and field experiences, the 1894 brochure contained a list of books assigned for educational "reading and study preparatory to the course." The books were divided into education texts such as J. P. Richter's *Levana*, Browning's *Educational Theories*, Painter's *History of Education*, and Lange's *Apperception*; works on Froebel and the kindergarten by Elizabeth Peabody, Emma Marwedel, Elizabeth Harrison, and others; and works on "Elementary Science" including Ruskin's *The Ethics of Dust* and *The Stones of Venice*, and Frye's *Brooks and Brook Basins*. Perusal of the titles gives a sense of Lucy Wheelock's expectations for students' general preparation in these fields. Jean Paul Richter's *Levana*, for example, was a much-read German philosophical discourse on the importance of education in the home. Written in 1806 in a difficult and antiquated style, the book is filled with classical and historical references, and contains chapters on subjects ranging from "The Individuality of the Ideal Man" and "On the Spirit of the Age," to "Children's Games" and "The Screaming and Crying of Children." Dedicated to Queen Caroline of Bavaria, the section on female education includes advice on the private instruction of princesses, and emphasizes throughout that above all, women are to be educated for

their role as mothers and hence as teachers of young children. John Ruskin's *The Ethics of Dust* is a series of beginning lectures on crystallography written in the form of parables, with different elements taking speaking parts, and chapter titles such as "Crystal Virtues," "Crystal Quarrels," and "Crystal Sorrows." Dedicated to "The Real Little Housewives whose gentle listening and thoughtful questioning enabled the writer to write this book," the book was intended not as a true introduction to the subject, but as a popular work. Ruskin's classic, *The Stones of Venice*, is a detailed guide to Venetian art and architecture for cultivated travelers. Written in 1879, the book was meant to further appreciation of Italian history and culture and illustrate Ruskin's method of aesthetic education.³¹

Wheelock's own specialty was Froebel's play ideas for mothers; this was the course she particularly enjoyed teaching, and it best exemplified her ideas about education. She classed Froebel's *Mother Play and Nursery Songs* among the world's few great books, along with the Bible, the dialogues of Plato, and the poems of Wordsworth and Tennyson. Wheelock's ability to lead her female students to a new understanding of children and childhood, and of their role in aiding child development was at the heart of her educational method. Through discussion of stages of children's growth and simulations of Froebelian games, she elucidated the meanings concealed in children's play and penetrated the mysteries of child thought and behavior. For women interested in young children this revelation of symbolism behind traditional children's activities, activities which many must have participated in themselves, was a powerful and fascinating experience. From the accounts of some of her students, Wheelock's lectures on Froebel were very moving. As one wrote,

I never once thought that in Pat-a-Cake lay the meaning that each one must do his part willingly at the right time, and that in Tick Tack the importance of an orderly life and an orderly environment are portrayed. And so on through all of Froebel's plays. Not one can be studied without showing to the mother and teacher the careful training that each child needs; the deep meaning that lies in even the simplest plays. To the child each play unconsciously gives continuity and likewise we learn that each child grows toward unity as he is made in the image of God.³²

Though Froebelianism was the main source for Lucy Wheelock's kindergarten training curriculum, she was not a dogmatist. Unlike some in the early kindergarten movement, she remained open to new ideas. In the years just after the turn of the century she became a central figure in the controversy between

orthodox Froebelians and liberal reformers dividing the American kindergarten movement. An early supporter of G. Stanley Hall, Wheelock believed in the efficacy of new scientific methods of child study, and chaired the Committee of Nineteen, a group appointed in 1903 by the International Kindergarten Union to deal with dissension over curriculum. But the divisions in the movement were too deep, and in 1909 three separate reports were presented to the International Kindergarten Union: a conservative report by Susan Blow, the old-line Froebelian from St. Louis; a liberal report from Patty Smith Hill of Teachers College; and a moderate or "liberal conservative" report by Lucy Wheelock and Elizabeth Harrison, founder of the Chicago Kindergarten College.³³

Wheelock's eclecticism was reflected in curricular changes at the Wheelock School as it evolved during the early part of the twentieth century. There is a gap in documentation from the 1894 brochure to the first published yearbook in 1915. Subsequent yearbooks and brochures show that Lucy Wheelock invited noted educators and psychologists to give classes at her school, and included course work on other preschool methodologies, such as the controversial theories of Dr. Maria Montessori, and the ideas of the nursery school movement. She also stressed the importance of teachers' awareness of social issues, arranging for courses and guest lectures on "Americanization and Democracy," and "Social Education," the latter with a reading list of works by John Dewey.³⁴

In fact Wheelock and Dewey shared some ideas about curriculum. Like Dewey, Wheelock believed in the usefulness of the culture-epochs approach, the idea that children should study cultural time periods in an evolutionary and historical sequence. Her views on this issue, however, seem closer to those of G. Stanley Hall, who promoted a deterministic, developmental form of curricular recapitulationism, of which Dewey was critical. Like Dewey, Wheelock supported early manual exercises as a form of industrial training and to foster motivation in future industrial workers. This, however, was by no means her principal rationale for instituting kindergartens as it was for some kindergarten advocates such as William Torrey Harris, the Hegelian philosopher-school superintendent who was an important influence on Dewey's early thinking. But the greatest similarity was in Wheelock's and Dewey's emphasis on the importance of the dynamic synthesis of external activities and internal spontaneity, and in their focus on future development or growth rather than on the acquisition of static knowledge, issues at the heart of the curricular debates over "Progressive Education." The method Wheelock thought best made this connection between inner and outer motivation was Froebel's occupations, and, though Dewey modified Froebel's idea considerably, he too used this term and came to focus upon occupations as a key pedagogical method. Wheelock's views on curriculum and motivation in early childhood education, which formed the basis for her voca-

tional training curriculum, can be seen in her description of a young child engaged in a Froebelian occupation.

The four-year old Tommy or Charlie who is busied with his weaving, his sewing or his intertwining is carrying on in embryo one of the great industries of the race. The true value of the work is secured for him by the wise co-worker and friend who understands the bearings and the issue of this daily work, not only as a means of industrial training but as a powerful factor in the development of the will by which the man, hidden in the child, is to mold the world to himself. That the spontaneous activity of the child shall be so guided as to become the regulated activity of the citizen is the purpose of the manual work of this period. The *doing* becomes valuable as it gives the power and the will to *do*, and so makes the entrance into one's rightful kingdom.⁵⁵

Prescription for Women's Education

The vocational curriculum of the Wheelock School became Lucy Wheelock's general prescription for women's education. Wheelock was not opposed to liberal education for women, but felt it did not meet women's or society's needs for education for motherhood. Though she took pains not to condemn liberal education, Wheelock voiced some of the concerns raised by conservatives in the ongoing debate over collegiate education for women. Her ideas were more similar to proponents of the new domestic curricula instituted in many colleges during the 1920s, such as the home economics movement founded by Ellen Swallow Richards, implemented by Marion Talbot at Wellesley and the University of Chicago, and the interdisciplinary major in euthenics at Vassar.⁵⁶

Wheelock thought that the ancient Biblical conception of "woman's place in the household" should influence women's education. In her view the "ideal woman" was the "Goddess of the Hearth, the High Priestess of the race, ministering at the altar of life, conserving the old beliefs in the beauty and sanctity of the home and the purity of the family." Though she felt women's capacity for higher education and leadership had been "amply demonstrated" and that the women's colleges "modeled after the medieval traditions . . . which governed . . . colleges for men" had produced "scholarly women" and "opened up new fields of enterprise and interest to women," liberal arts colleges fell short because they failed to recognize the "special functions and qualities of women," childbearing and childrearing. The problem with collegiate education for women, Wheelock

concluded, was that as "we do not belong to a race of celibates," women needed to be trained for child nurture or they might become poor mothers.⁵⁷ Her solution to the problem of the failure of the women's colleges to educate women for motherhood was the kindergarten training school. She agreed that training school courses needed "extension and enrichment . . . to provide a better academic foundation for the specific subjects pursued, and better opportunities for general culture," but thought that the "largest hope educationally" for all women and for society lay with the attempt of kindergarten training schools to "equip young women to fill adequately woman's sphere." In fact, Wheelock earlier appealed to female liberal arts college graduates to seek kindergarten training and become kindergarten teachers because "those who have the broadest knowledge of science, the deepest appreciation of art, the best literary taste, and the soundest judgment, sympathy and intelligence" should be kindergartners.⁵⁸

Wheelock's plan for women's education consisted of four main types of training: physical education, aesthetic and cultural education, home-making, and child study. To protect their own health and that of their families women should understand "the laws of health and sanitation" and thus needed to take courses in biology, physiology, dietetics and food preparation. Stressing the importance of aesthetic appreciation and refinement, Wheelock hoped her students would "long for the conversation of the wise and learn to understand it," and "be able to open the door to this noble companionship" to those under their guidance. She encouraged familiarization with the classics of children's and adult literature, and instruction in reading and telling stories to children, suggesting that women join the National Story Tellers' League. With a reference to Harvard President Charles W. Eliot's idea that the ability to speak one's native language was the "test of culture" and because women were to serve as grammatical models for children, Wheelock also emphasized that women's study of literature should include the acquisition of habits of correct expression. Here again she encouraged joining an association, the Society for the Study of Spoken English. Wheelock's third area of education for women was home-making. To enable women to make a "Home Beautiful," they needed to take courses in fine arts including art history, "the study of pictures and casts with reference to their selection for different rooms in the home and for the school," and studio art, and should have musical training as well so that they could sing to children. Finally, Wheelock thought women needed to be knowledgeable about children. For this she recommended Froebelian training, of course, and child study, and underlined the importance of learning to evaluate toys to facilitate children's imaginative play.⁵⁹

Wheelock's rationale for why women needed what she called a "good general education" was practical. For each subject women studied she supplied a

reason related to their future role as wives, homemakers and mothers. It was this that most distinguished her conception of women's education from that of the women's liberal arts colleges. "The kind of knowledge" Wheelock thought was "of most worth to young women," the title of her article, was determined by their gender and future vocation. In fact, she went so far as to directly equate the education of women with that of young children, which she saw as "inseparable" because she viewed motherhood as the ultimate goal of women's lives.⁴⁰

Conclusions

The curriculum of Lucy Wheelock's kindergarten training school around the turn of the century exemplified progressivism and what would become Progressive Education applied to women's post-secondary education. At the heart of this new model for women's education lay an assumption about women's motivation and a prescription for women's lives, based on older, more traditional religious and cultural concepts of vocation and the proper role of women in society. Lucy Wheelock was motivated to become a teacher primarily by religious beliefs in the importance of serving humankind, particularly future generations, and by her reverence for young children. For Wheelock, the discovery of the kindergarten and of the idea of teaching young children had been a religious experience, a true vocational calling. Religion provided both the impetus and the rationale for the vocation she found. Kindergarten teaching and teacher training also satisfied important societally-imposed needs for Lucy Wheelock. As an educated, single woman from a middle-class background, she sought socially acceptable, meaningful, moderately remunerative, and relatively gentle work. Though never a mother herself, Wheelock was strongly committed to the concept of motherhood and to the importance of mothers educating their own young children. The ways in which religious, cultural, and other factors interacted to influence Lucy Wheelock's personal vocational commitment and career and those of women like her is a question warranting further investigation. Some of her contemporaries, after all, like her close friend Alice Stone Blackwell, and like Marion Talbot, made different life choices.

Lucy Wheelock was eager to demonstrate her solution to the "woman question" to other women, and actively promoted her particular prescription for women's education. It is difficult to ascertain, however, how the religious and cultural factors affecting Wheelock's decision to become a kindergarten teacher and kindergarten teacher trainer influenced students. Did they feel as strongly Lucy Wheelock's almost messianic zeal for kindergarten teaching and devotion to the cause of young children? These issues bear further study, as do the larger questions of the effects of Lucy Wheelock's prescription for women's education

and of the specific effects of differing models and types of women's post-secondary education. Preliminary analysis of Wheelock College alumnae records and interviews with graduates suggest that Lucy Wheelock's ideas about educating women and the post-secondary kindergarten training school curriculum in which they were embodied may have had an important impact on graduates' lives. The possibility of finding identifiable effects of particular historical higher education curricula should be a topic of future research.⁴¹

Not surprisingly, given the traditional nature of her views on the role of women and unlike many of the presidents and faculty of the private women's liberal arts colleges, Lucy Wheelock was not a vocal advocate of women's rights. The subject does not appear in her writings and correspondence. Moreover, the "uneasy connection between feminism and women's educational advancement" which, to use Barbara Solomon's words, characterized the early stages of women's collegiate education, was uneasy indeed in the post-suffrage era when a resurgence of interest in domesticity among college-educated women accompanied a declining rate of entry into the masculine professions. Some historians have viewed this change as a waning of feminism.⁴² If feminism failed to take hold in the lifestyles and career patterns of college-educated women, one reason was because it did not address the centrality of motherhood as an enduring concern for women or produce a new constellation of social values to aid women in combining commitments to their careers and their children. This was where Lucy Wheelock succeeded.

Though the feminine model of progressive post-secondary education which Wheelock developed may have been anchored in traditional beliefs about the role of women in society, it contributed to the creation of new forms of child care and preschool education which would eventually make it easier for future generations of women to combine motherhood and work. Like Lucy Sprague Mitchell, Abigail Eliot, and others who followed in the movement for early childhood education, Lucy Wheelock was committed to improving the quality of women's and children's lives through education.⁴³ For Lucy Wheelock and most women of her generation, mothering and career were mutually exclusive or serial choices. Lucy Wheelock did not bridge the gap between child rearing and career in actuality, as Mitchell did in her own life, nor did she make this gap seem narrower to her students. Wheelock continued to believe that women's first responsibility was to their own children at home, and that mothers of young children belonged at home and not in the work force, even in schools. But the development of a curriculum for women's education centered on children's education and training teachers to work with young children were necessary first steps to providing the kind of awareness and programs which were prerequisites for the entry of large numbers of women into the work force.

Where Lucy Wheelock failed was in her inability to see the limitations of a gender-based vocational curriculum restricting women to stereotypic roles as teachers and mothers. Her search for sources of knowledge about teaching and mothering led her to the pragmatics of the everyday activities of children. Like John Dewey, she sought inspiration in the stuff of daily life, finding meaning in the interactions of young children with their finite, concrete environments. But like Dewey, she underestimated the potential tedium of practical knowledge, and sometimes became mired in the minutiae of everyday events, and the occupational and personal concerns of teachers and mothers.

Despite the limitations of Lucy Wheelock's prescription for women's education, behind the minutiae was a grand design, a plan for societal rejuvenation and renewal through kindergarten teachers and mothers working together with little children. Like many nineteenth-century thinkers, Wheelock's mind moved quickly from the mundane to the millennial. From a discussion of why providing a professional entertainer for a child's party may stunt imagination, and the importance of passing law to keep children under the age of fifteen out of theaters—topics on which she felt women as a future mothers needed to be educated—Wheelock concluded her thoughts on vocational training for teaching and motherhood with a visionary statement of her hopes for the salvation of humankind through the improvement of women's education.

The goal is nothing less than the redemption of the world through the better education of those who are to shape it and make it. The keeper of the gates of tomorrow is the little child upon a mother's arms. The way of that kingdom which is to come on earth, as in heaven, is placed in the hands of a child, and that child's hands a woman holds.⁴⁴

NOTES

1. Patricia Albjerg Graham, "So Much to Do: Guides for Historical Research on Women in Higher Education," *Teachers College Record* 76 (1975), pp. 421-430. Research for this article was supported in part by funds from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation given by Radcliffe College for research at the Schlesinger Library. I am grateful to Margaret C. Dollar for the care she devoted to data collection, to Wheelock College for providing access to its alumnae records, and to Sally Schwager and Joyce Antler for their helpful comments and suggestions.
2. See, for example, Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), and Barbara Miller Solomon, *In the Company of Educated Women: A History of Women and Higher Education in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985). Veysey and Solomon both discuss the importance of vocationalism but do not

deal specifically with post-secondary vocational education. Thomas Woody's comprehensive, two volume *A History of Women's Education in the United States* (New York: The Science Press, 1929), contains detailed descriptions of vocational training programs.

3. See, for instance, Willystine Goodsell, *The Education of Women* (New York: Harper, 1959). Recent studies of women's collegiate and university education include Jill K. Conway, "Perspectives on the History of Women's Education in the United States," *History of Education Quarterly* 14 (1974), pp. 1-12; Sarah H. Gordon, "Smith College Students: The First Ten Classes, 1879-1888," *History of Education Quarterly* 15 (Summer 1975) pp. 147-167; Patricia Albjerg Graham, "Expansion and Exclusion: A History of Women in American Higher Education," *Signs* 3 (1978), pp. 759-773; Lynn D. Gordon, "Co-Education on Two Campuses: Berkeley and Chicago, 1890-1912," in *Woman's Being, Woman's Place: Female Identity and Vocation in American History*, ed. Mary Kelley (Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1979), pp. 171-193; David F. Allmendinger, Jr., "Mount Holyoke Students Encounter the Need for Life Planning, 1837-1850," *History of Education Quarterly* 19 (1979), pp. 27-46; Elizabeth Alden Green, *Mary Lyon and Mount Holyoke: Opening the Gates* (Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 1979); Cynthia Horsburgh Requardt, "Alternative Professions for Goucher College Graduates, 1892-1910," *Maryland Historical Magazine* 74 (1979), pp. 274-281; Patricia A. Palmieri, "Here Was Fellowship: A Social Portrait of Academic Women at Wellesley College, 1880-1920," *History of Education Quarterly* (1983), pp. 195-214. Joyce Antler does discuss vocationalism at the women's colleges in her article "Changing Ideals of Higher Education for Women," in *The Undergraduate Woman: Issues in Educational Equity*, ed. Pamela J. Perun (Lexington, Ma: Lexington Books, 1982), pp. 15-42.
4. For descriptions of various kinds of workers' education for women see *Sisterhood and Solidarity: Workers' Education for Women, 1914-1984*, eds. Joyce L. Kornbluh and Mary Frederickson (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1984).
5. Joan Jacobs Brumberg and Nancy Tomes include discussion of training for women's occupations in their review article "Women in the Professions: A Research Agenda for American Historians," *Reviews in American History* (June, 1982), pp. 275-296. On nursing see Barbara Melosh, *The Physicians' Hand: Work, Cultures and Conflict in American Nursing* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982). On social work see Roy Lubove, *The Professional Altruist: The Emergence of Social Work as a Career, 1880-1930* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965); Penina Glazer and Miriam Slater, *Unequal Colleagues: Women's Entrance into the Professions* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1987), and Barbara B. Brand, "Preparing Womanly Professionals: Zilpha Drew Smith and the Boston School for Social Workers," unpublished paper presented at 11th Annual Conference on Women and Education, Simmons College, October 24, 1985. There are studies of teaching as an occupation for women, and women teachers, some of which mention training. See Richard M. Bernard and Maris A. Vinovskis, "The Female School Teacher in Ante-Bellum Massachusetts," *Journal of Social History* 10 (1977), pp. 332-345; Maris A. Vinovskis and Richard M. Bernard, "Beyond Catharine Beecher: Female Education in the Antebellum Period," *Signs* 3 (1978), pp. 856-859; Deborah Fitts, "Una and the Lion: The Feminization of District School-Teaching and its Effects on the Roles of Students and Teachers in Nineteenth-Century Massachusetts," in Barbara Finkelstein, ed., *Regulated Children, Liberated Children: Education in Psychohistorical Perspective* (New York: Psychohistory Press, 1979), pp. 140-157; Keith Melder, "Women's High Calling: The Teaching Profession in America, 1830-1960," *American Studies* 13 (1972), pp.

19-32; *Woman's "True" Profession: Voices from the History of Teaching*, ed. Nancy Hoffman (Old Westbury, N.Y.: The Feminist Press, 1981); Geraldine Clifford, "Eve: Redeemed by Education and Teaching School," *History of Education Quarterly* 21 (Winter 1981), pp. 479-492; Joan M. Jensen, "Not Only Ours But Others: The Quaker Teaching Daughters of the Mid-Atlantic, 1790-1850," *History of Education Quarterly* 24 (1983), pp. 3-20; Polly Welts Kaufman, *Women Teachers on the Frontier* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984); Myra H. Strober and Audri Gordon Lanford, "The Feminization of Public School Teaching: Cross-Sectional Analysis, 1850-1880," *Signs* 11 (1986), pp. 212-235, and Madelyn Holmes, "The Pioneers: Female Public School Teachers in Salem, Massachusetts, 1850s to 1850s," *Essex Institute Historical Collections* (Fall, 1986). For sources on the history of professionalization and teacher education which do not include discussion of women see Paul H. Mattingly, *The Classless Profession: American Schoolmen in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: New York University Press, 1975); Merle Borrowman, *The Liberal and the Technical in Teacher Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1956), and *Teacher Education in America: A Documentary History*, ed. Merle Borrowman (New York: Teachers College Press, 1965). Research on the training of women teachers is beginning to appear. See, among others, Mary J. Oates, "The Professional Preparation of Parochial School Teachers, 1870-1940," *Historical Journal of Massachusetts* 12 (January, 1984), pp. 60-72; Susan A. Adler, "An Historical Analysis of Early Field Experiences," paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, La., April, 1984; Kathleen Underwood, "The Pace of Their Own Lives: Teacher Training and the Life Course of Western Women," *Pacific Historical Review* (forthcoming).

6. For good discussions of these broad changes in American education see among others David Tyack, *The One Best System* (Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press, 1974); Stanley K. Schultz, *The Culture Factory: Boston Public Schools, 1789-1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973); and David Tyack and Elizabeth Hansot, *Managers of Virtue* (New York: Basic Books, 1982).
7. The question of whether women should be educated comparably to men, and what comparability meant in terms of curricula and practice, was an issue of enormous debate at the women's liberal arts colleges and in society at large. For overviews of this debate see, among others, Rosalind Rosenberg, *Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), and Solomon, *In the Company of Educated Women*. Patricia A. Palmieri discusses the evolution of ideals for the education of women at Wellesley in her article "Incipit Vita Nuova: Founding Ideals of the Wellesley College Community," *History of Higher Education Annual* 3 (1983), pp. 59-78. For other descriptions of differences among the women's liberal arts colleges in addition to sources already cited see Roberta Frankfort, *Collegiate Women: Domesticity and Career in Turn-of-the-Century America* (New York: New York University Press, 1977); Palmieri's essay review of Frankfort, "Paths and Pitfalls: Illuminating Women's Educational History," *Harvard Educational Review* 49 (1979), pp. 534-541, and Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *Alma Mater* (New York: Knopf, 1984).
8. Lucy Wheelock, "The Kind of Knowledge of Most Worth to Young Women," in *Parents and Their Problems*, ed. Mary Harmon Weeks (Washington, D.C.: National Congress on Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations, 1914), pp. 146-157.
9. For discussion of the post-college dilemma faced by a small but growing number of female

graduates see Joyce Antler, "After College What? New Graduates and the Family Claim," *American Quarterly* 32 (1980), pp. 409-435, and Solomon, pp. 115-140.

10. On the views of Willard, Beecher and Lyon on women's education, see, among others, Anne Firor Scott, "The Ever Widening Circle: The Diffusion of Feminist Values from the Troy Female Seminary, 1822-1872," *History of Education Quarterly* 19 (1979), pp. 3-26; *Pioneers of Women's Education in the United States*, ed. Willystine Goodsell (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1931); Kathryn Kish Sklar, *Catharine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973), and Green, *Mary Lyon and Mount Holyoke*. For descriptions and discussion of early female seminaries and academies see Woody; Keith Melder, "Mask of Oppression: The Female Seminary Movement in the United States," *New York History* 55 (1974), pp. 261-279 and Lynne Templeton Brickley, "Female Academies are Everywhere Establishing: the Beginning of secondary education for women in the United States, 1790-1830: a review of the literature," Special Qualifying Paper, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1982, and Susan Lloyd, *A Singular School: Abbot Academy, 1828-1973* (Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 1979).
11. For a good discussion of the history of women's vocational education which deals with some of these issues see Geraldine Joncich Clifford, "'Marry, Stitch, Die or Do Worse' Educating Women for Work," in *Work, Youth, and Schooling: Historical Perspectives on Vocationalism in American Education*, eds. Harvey Kantor and David B. Tyack (Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press, 1982), pp. 223-268.
12. David F. Allmendinger, Jr., makes this point in his article "Mount Holyoke Students Encounter the Need for Life-Planning, 1837-1850," pp. 40-41.
13. For an interesting analysis of economic factors affecting the job market for female teachers in turn-of-the-century New England see Susan Carter, "Occupational Segregation, Teachers' Wages, and American Economic Growth," *Journal of Economic History* (June, 1986).
14. The majority of sources state 1857 as the year of Wheelock's birth; a few, however, give 1859. See Winifred Linderman, "Biography Report," Lucy Wheelock biography file, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College. Other biographical sources on Wheelock include her own unpublished autobiography, "My Life Story," Lucy Wheelock Collection, Archives, Wheelock College; Abigail Eliot, "Miss Lucy Wheelock—Her Contributions to Early Childhood Education," Lucy Wheelock Collection, Archives, Wheelock College; Eliot's biographical sketch of Wheelock in *Notable American Women, 1607-1950*, Vol. III, ed. Edward T. James (Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press, 1971), pp. 577-578; and entries on Wheelock in *Who Was Who in America*, Vol. II (Chicago: Marquis, 1950), p. 570, in *The National Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, Vol. XXXIX (New York: James T. White and Company, 1954), p. 119; *A Woman of the Century*, eds. Frances E. Willard and Mary Livermore (Buffalo, N.Y.: C. W. Moulton, 1893), p. 765.
15. *Calendar of Wellesley College, 1875-76-77-78*, p. 4, Archives, Wellesley College. For descriptions of the founding of Wellesley and the college's early campus environment see *Wellesley College, 1875-1975: A Century of Women*, ed. Jean Glasscock (Wellesley: Wellesley College, 1975); Horowitz, *Alma Mater*; Patricia A. Palmieri, "In Adamless Eden: A Portrait of Academic Women at Wellesley College, 1875-1920" (Ed.D. diss. Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1980), and the various other articles by Palmieri already cited.

16. On Wheelock's years at the Chauncy-Hall School see Thomas Cushing, *Historical Sketch of the Chauncy-Hall School, 1828-1894* (Boston: David Clapp & Son, 1895).
17. Wheelock, "My Life Story," p. 10. Marion Talbot's education at Chauncy-Hall is mentioned in Rosalind Rosenberg's *Separate Spheres*. Letters from Alice Stone Blackwell to Lucy Wheelock, October 14, 1930 and May 23, 1945, Lucy Wheelock Collection, Archives, Wheelock College. Biographical essay on Alice Stone Blackwell by Geoffrey Blodgett in *Notable American Women*, Vol. 1, pp. 156-158.
18. Calendar of Wellesley College, 1887-88, p. 49. On Wencabaugh see biography file, Archives, Wellesley College, and Margarethe Mueller, *Carla Wencelbacke, Pioneer* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1908).
19. Lucy Wheelock, "My Life Story," p. 11.
20. This frequently cited quotation appears in Winifred E. Bain, *Leadership in Childhood Education, Images and Realities: A History of Wheelock College, 1888-89 to 1963-64* (Wheelock College, 1964), pp. 11-12.
21. Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, "Origin and Growth of the Kindergarten," *Education* 2 (May/June 1882), p. 511. For biographical sources on Peabody see Ruth M. Baylor, *Elizabeth Palmer Peabody: Kindergarten Pioneer* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1965); Hersha S. Fisher, "The Education of Elizabeth Peabody," (Ed.D. diss. Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1980); Barbara Beatty, "A Vocation From On High: Preschool Teaching and Advocacy as a Career for Women in Nineteenth-Century Boston" (Ed.D. diss. Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1981); and *Letters of Elizabeth Palmer Peabody: American Renaissance Woman*, ed. Bruce A. Ronda (Middletown: Wesleyan University, 1984).
22. For a contemporary analysis of factors which influence how women teachers think about their work see Sari Knopp Biklen, "Can Elementary Schoolteaching Be a Career?: A Search for New Ways of Understanding Women's Work," *Issues in Education* 111 (Winter 1985), pp. 215-231.
23. Elizabeth Peabody, *Lectures in the Training Schools for Kindergartners* (Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1893), p. 13.
24. Elizabeth Peabody, *Kindergarten Messenger* 12 (January 1874), p. 7 and (December 1874), p. 20.
25. Wheelock, "My Life Story," pp. 14 and 22. The Lucy Wheelock Collection in the archives at Wheelock College contains some of Wheelock's correspondence with Barnard and Hall.
26. Wheelock, "My Life Story," p. 41. Bain, *Leadership in Childhood Education*, p. 13.
27. "Kindergarten Training Class at Chauncy Hall School." Brochure, Lucy Wheelock Collection, Archives, Wheelock College.
28. *Calendar of Wellesley College, 1895-96*. Archives, Wellesley College, pp. 17-18. See for instance "Catalogue of the Normal School," *Twentieth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools of the City of Boston*, School Doc. No. 4, March, 1900, p. 23.
29. Bain, *Leadership in Childhood Education*, p. 13.

30. "Kindergarten Training Class at Chauncy-Hall School," Brochure, Lucy Wheelock Collection, Archives, Wheelock College.
31. Jean Paul Richter, *Levana* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1891); John Ruskin, *The Ethics of Dust* (New York: Maynard, Merrill, and Company, 1894); John Ruskin, *The Stones of Venice* (London: George Allen, 1900). For a comparison with the curricular ideals of professors at Wellesley College during this period see Palmieri, "In Adamless Eden: A Portrait of Academic Women at Wellesley College, 1875-1920."
32. Wheelock, "My Life Story," p. 76.
33. For more detailed discussions of this debate and sources on the American kindergarten movement see, among others, Nina C. Vandewalker, *The Kindergarten in American Education* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908); Evelyn Weber, *The Kindergarten: Its Encounter with Educational Thought in America* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1969); Elizabeth Dale Ross, *The Kindergarten Crusade* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1976); Marvin Lazerson, "Urban Reform and the Schools: Kindergartens in Massachusetts, 1880-1915," *History of Education Quarterly* 11 (Summer 1971), pp. 115-137; Karen Wolk Feinstein, "Kindergarten, Feminism, and the Professionalization of Motherhood," *International Journal of Women's Studies* 3 (1980), pp. 23-38; Dom Cavallo, "From Perfection to Habit: Moral Training in the American Kindergarten, 1860-1920," *History of Education Quarterly* 16 (Summer 1976), pp. 147-161; and Michael Steven Shapiro, *Child's Garden: The Kindergarten from Froebel to Dewey* (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1983).
34. Wheelock School catalog for 1919-1920, Wheelock College Collection, Archives, Wheelock College.
35. Lucy Wheelock, "The Appeal of the Kindergarten to College Women," *The Congregationalist* (June 1, 1893), p. 861. For detailed discussion of these curricular debates see Herbert M. Kliebard's *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958* (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986), particularly pp. 30-72. In his essay, *The School and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1900), pp. 116-138, Dewey acknowledged that the Froebelian kindergarten had in some ways paved the way for progressive education, particularly in its introduction of play to education. His objection to Froebelianism, an objection with which Lucy Wheelock to a lesser extent concurred, was with its rigidity and dogmatism. On the evolution of Dewey's thought see in particular "John Dewey Reconsidered," from Joseph Featherstone's book *What Schools Can Do* (New York: Liveright, 1976), pp. 64-81.
36. See among others Sheila M. Rothman, *Woman's Proper Place: A History of Changing Ideals and Practices, 1870 to the Present* (New York: Basic Books, 1978); Rosenberg, *Beyond Separate Spheres*; and Solomon, *In the Company of Educated Women* for overviews on the debate over women's college education. On the introduction of domestic curricula at women's liberal arts colleges, home economics and eugenics see Antler, "Culture, Service and World: Changing Ideals of Higher Education for Women" and Rosenberg, *Beyond Separate Spheres*. For examples of some of the advice literature on the education of girls and women see Mary Livermore's *What Shall We Do with our Daughters, Superfluous Women and other Lectures* (Boston: Lee, Shepard, 1883) and H. Le Baron Briggs, *Girls and Education* (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin, 1911).

37. Wheelock, "The Kind of Knowledge of Most Worth to Young Women," p. 147.
38. Wheelock, "The Kind of Knowledge of Most Worth to Young Women," pp. 147, 148, and Wheelock, "The Appeal of the Kindergarten to College Women," p. 861.
39. Wheelock, "The Kind of Knowledge of Most Worth to Young Women," pp. 149, 150 and 151.
40. Wheelock, "The Kind of Knowledge of Most Worth to Young Women," pp. 151, 152 and 153.
41. Analysis of data in the possession of the author on the career and life patterns of Wheelock graduates from the classes of 1889 to 1914 and comparisons with data on graduates from other women's institutions, specifically Simmons, Mt. Holyoke, and Wellesley Colleges, indicates there were considerable differences in marriage rates and in the tendency to continue work after marriage, though the data are problematic. For an interesting comparison with Simmons College, which was also involved in vocational training, see Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, "Single-Sex Education and Leadership: the Early Years of Simmons College," in Sari Knopp Biklen, and Marilyn B. Branigan, eds. *Women and Educational Leadership* (Lexington, Ma: Lexington Books, 1980), pp. 93-111.
42. Solomon, xvii. For different perspectives on the supposed decline of feminism in the years following the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment see, among others, William L. O'Neill, *Everyone Was Brave: A History of Feminism in America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971); William Chafe, *The American Woman: Her Changing Social, Economic, and Political Roles, 1920-1970* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972); Rothman, *Woman's Proper Place*; Conway, "Perspectives on the History of Women's Higher Education in the United States"; and Susan Ware, *Beyond Suffrage: Women in the New Deal* (Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press, 1981).
43. On Lucy Sprague Mitchell and the Bank Street College of Education in New York see Joyce Antler, "Feminism as Life Process: The Life and Career of Lucy Sprague Mitchell," *Feminist Studies* 7 (Spring 1981), pp. 134-157 and "Progressive Education and the Scientific Study of the Child: An Analysis of the Bureau of Educational Experiments," *Teachers College Record* 83 (Summer 1982): 559-591.
44. Wheelock, "The Kind of Knowledge of Most Worth to Young Women," p. 154.

The Challenge of Jane Addams: A Research Note

ELLEN CONDLIFFE LAGEMANN

Teachers College, Columbia University

EARLY IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY, Jane Addams offered some astute critical observations about recent developments in American higher education. In essence, she worried that "the mere collecting and disseminating of knowledge" was becoming the exclusive aim of an increasing number of colleges and universities. She was not opposed to research or to rigorously intellectual curricula. But she was firmly convinced that the development and pursuit of knowledge, apart from opportunities to test and use it, would not serve society well. Disconnected from the immediacy of life, knowledge would encumber students rather than empower them to identify, make, and pursue idealistic commitments. It would also add little to the capacity of teachers, ministers, and public officials to serve the community as insightfully as they might otherwise do. Beyond that, unrelated to actual efforts to humanize life, research might create only partial truths, with consequences untested in action.¹

Addams's observations about the increasingly narrow academic trend she saw emerging in higher education derived in part from insights associated with her own experience. As those familiar with her life will quickly recognize, she herself was best able to master, transform, and use knowledge when she saw a personally vital or "subjectively necessary" aim for learning—a plan of action to be facilitated through study. Thus, her admiration for her father and her related wish to "understand life as he did" enabled her to become an eager reader as a child.² Her belief that educational attainment would give women new "intellectual force" to bring to the fulfillment of their traditional roles as "breadgivers," in the process allowing them to gain "authorita [sic], right of speaker to make themselves heard," enabled her to become an avid student throughout the four years she spent at Rockford Seminary.³ And after she and Ellen Gates Starr moved to Hull House in September 1889, her determination to find ways to understand, interpret, and address, not only the problems of her neighbors, but also the related problems faced by a variety of other groups, including young, middle-class, educated women like herself, once again enhanced her capacity to acquire, evaluate, synthesize, apply, and reformulate new ideas and information. This determination was essential to Addams's inclination and ability to listen carefully

to her predominantly Italian, Bohemian, Polish, and Russian Jewish neighbors, however much their concerns differed from what she initially believed they needed and wanted; and to combine what she heard from them with the suggestions of purposes for Hull House simultaneously offered by Julia Lathrop and Florence Kelley. The result was a shift from a quasi-didactic, essentially philanthropic conception of the settlement to one based upon a fuller recognition of the importance of reciprocal exchange among different people and groups and of a commitment to social and political, as opposed to solely individual and educational, reform.

In marked contrast to these examples of Addams's ability to learn, change, and grow when there were immediate, important, and personally compelling reasons to do so were the eight years of painful, aimless living she endured between her graduation from Rockford and the establishment of Hull House. During this period, she found her knowledge and her efforts to continue her studies empty of worth. They represented a burden, indeed, a barrier to her capacity to "fulfill Woman's Noblest Mission" through service to others.⁴ Her paralysis arose, largely though not exclusively, from a failure to see a sufficiently challenging and personally appealing plan of service, an end to which her previous education and continuing study could be instrumental. Whether energized in their absence or energized in their presence, Addams obviously needed clearly perceived, practical, and immediate goals in order to make sense of the problems and questions her life placed before her.

Of course, a need for purposeful educational experience did not, in itself, make Addams unusual. But her unique capacity to be astutely self-conscious did make her especially agile in thinking about and using her experience to understand, empathize with, and illuminate the experience of others. This capacity provided a basis for her competence as a leader in a number of circles—circles as varied as her peer community at Rockford Seminary, where, as a classmate observed, "We never speculated as to why we liked to go to her room. . . . We just knew there was something 'doing' where she was, and that however mopey it might be elsewhere there was intellectual ozone in her vicinity"; and the worldwide community of feminists to which she later belonged.⁵ Equally important, these qualities formed the springboard for Addams's highly original and incisive social criticism.

Astute self-consciousness was essential, for example, to the argument she presented in *Democracy and Social Ethics*, a study of discrepancies between professed and lived beliefs and ideals, not in imagined, impersonal, or distant situations, but in familiar domains.⁶ One of these was middle-class American family life, where Addams observed a fundamental, and yet at the time rarely noted, problem of democracy in relationships between domestic servants and

their employers. Many of the latter engaged in charity work outside their homes at the same time that they behaved uncharitably to the people who worked for them in their homes. Beyond that, Addams's self-analysis was evident in her criticism of trends in higher education, which, as a neighbor of the University of Chicago (founded in 1892, three years after Hull House opened) and a friend of many University of Chicago faculty members, she knew at first hand. Because she understood the sources of her own education and the power knowledge had given her to study and act in behalf of democracy as a lived experiment and not merely a rhetorical ideal, she saw the highly academic tradition growing at Chicago and other research universities as a snare that would impede rather than facilitate progress in scholarship and education and ultimately in the development of intelligent and humane social policies. As with many of her observations, her criticisms of higher education were more "subjective" than "objective." They were neither abstract nor detached from avowed, personal commitments.

To appreciate fully the rootedness of Addams's thought in her own experience, one must analyze her education and her writings, especially her writings on education, in some detail—a task I have attempted elsewhere.⁷ My purpose here is simply to call attention to the close relationship between her life and her thought in order to underscore her significance as an intellectual of the first rank. One might think that the combination of social activism and intellectual activity marking her career would be obvious to all observers; but students of Addams have not tended to heed sufficiently the combination or the complex of relationships it involved.

To some extent, the great due given to Addams's deeds and the lesser attention paid to her ideas may have to do with contemporary perceptions. Victorian ladies, even unusual ones, were not expected to be great intellects, and those of her contemporaries who commented publicly upon her writings usually praised them as illuminating, while in the same breath discounting them as merely the work of a woman. When *Democracy and Social Ethics* appeared in 1902, for example, the economist Edwin Seligman wrote that "no other book by a woman shows such vitality, such masculinity of mental grasp and surefootedness"; and the jurist Oliver Wendell Holmes noted that Addams was "a big woman who knows at least the facts" and who had given him "more insight into the point of view of the working man and the poor" than he had had before.⁸ Beyond that, however, some of Addams's best-known works, for example, *Twenty Years at Hull House* (1910), were avowedly autobiographical, and all were obviously informed by commonsense, experience, and a hardly disguised subjectivity. Consequently, they were (and too often still are) read as testimony to *her* achievements rather than as serious works of social commentary speaking to enduring social, cultural, and political problems. The misreading is unfortunate

for many reasons, not least because it has limited study, criticism, and elaboration of her observations on social process and, even more, of the assumptions about politics embodied in them.

The view of politics as personal relationships that is essential to Addams's argument in *Democracy and Social Ethics*, for example, stands in marked contrast to the view of politics presented in contemporary works like Charles E. Merriam's *A History of American Political Theories*, published in 1903, and warrants far more analysis than it has received, especially as the political activities of Hull House residents are subjected to new study.⁹ Despite a long line of philosophers (one thinks instantly of Jonathan Edwards, Ralph Waldo Emerson, John Dewey, Israel Scheffler, and Michael Polanyi) who have pointed to the rootedness of intellectual power in the subjectively reflective capacity Addams had in abundance, the link between her life and her thought appears to have diminished serious appreciation of what she had to say. Further study of Addams's ideas would enrich feminist scholarship, as further inquiry into Addams's significance as a thinker would enrich the social history of ideas.

Besides underscoring the importance of further study of Addams's thought, consideration of the relationships between her life and writings is of value as a first step in analyzing the personal and immediate referents of her criticisms of higher education, possibly revealing significant connections between gender, professionalization, and the organization of higher education in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Acknowledging that what I am setting forth here is nothing more than a research suggestion, the following hypothetical argument may suggest what I mean.

In 1904, Addams gave a speech on immigration at the University of Chicago, in which she argued that "to let the scholar off with the mere collecting of knowledge, or yet with its transmission, or indeed to call his account closed with that still higher function of research, would be to throw away one of our most valuable assets. . . . The scholar has furnished us with no method by which to discover men, to spiritualize, to understand, to hold intercourse with aliens and to receive what they bring."¹⁰ One cannot help but wonder whether one of the underlying concerns prompting Addams's comments was the accelerating movement toward professionalization in sociology that would be evident the following year, when a circular signed by eight men invited sociologists to gather at the next joint meeting of the American Historical Association, the American Economic Association, and the American Political Science Association, to establish their own special organization, the American Sociological Association (ASA).¹¹ As Mary Furer has observed, the constitution adopted at that 1905 meeting "clearly subordinated practical sociology and concentrated power in the hands of the university elite."¹² Like the signatories to the ASA's organizational

call, members of the university elite in sociology were almost exclusively male, and, for many years thereafter, the ASA remained a largely male preserve. Indeed, according to Mary Jo Deegan, "from 1906 to 1930, the Association never elected a woman to the four highest offices, and rarely included them as major speakers, section organizers, or committee members."¹³

As Albion Small suggested in his 1916 account of the early history of sociology in the United States, the founding of the ASA accelerated but, in fact, did not initiate the transformation of this field. According to Small, the professionalization of sociology began in 1876 with the founding (first at Johns Hopkins) of departments of "advanced" study in which one could pursue "critical as distinguished from elementary study of social science."¹⁴ Written to advance professionalization, Small's history failed to consider an equally plausible alternative chronology, in which the beginnings of professionalization would be dated by the founding of the American Social Science Association (ASSA) in 1865.

Modelled upon the British National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, organized by Lord Brougham in 1857, the ASSA was established in recognition of the national or at least translocal nature of mounting post-Civil War concern with building libraries, schools, and other institutions of social and cultural improvement and with more effectively addressing problems of deviance, drunkenness, crime, poverty, and familial dissolution. The assumption was that if people with different primary interests, from different geographic localities, shared insights, experience, and knowledge, they could infuse reform and benevolent efforts with "convictions based on careful enquiry."¹⁵ Hence, the ASSA was intended to advance "social science" as a unified pursuit combining social action and social inquiry and involving reformers and thinkers interested in a great variety of problems and policies. It was equally open to men and women. Because the ASSA was an eclectic and not a specialized organization, it was certainly, as Small implied in his history, a "pre-professional" organization. But to the extent that it helped social scientists band together across localities, it provided a necessary basis for subsequent movement toward differentiation along occupational as opposed to geographic lines. Contra Small, therefore, the founding of the ASSA, an organization which even he described as "the mother of all subsequent social science organizations in the United States," may be taken as the beginning of professionalization in social science.¹⁶ It facilitated the emergence of many specialized reform organizations and many specialized academic associations, including the American Historical Association (1884), the American Economic Association (1885), the American Political Science Association (1903), and ultimately the American Sociological Association (1905).¹⁷

Not surprisingly, the dating of the origins of professionalization among social scientists, generally, and among sociologists, particularly, shapes how one

sees the subsequent unfolding of the process. Following Small's chronology for sociology, the founding of the ASA was a natural, linear result of a process beginning with formal, university-based teaching and research. But following the alternative chronology beginning with the founding of the ASA, the organization of the ASA marked the assertion and institutionalization of new aspirations that had little to do with "social science" as it had begun to develop immediately after the Civil War and a great deal to do with the university as an institution encouraging the separation of different, specialized knowledge domains and the concentration of knowledge-developing functions within its walls. So conceived, professionalization was a process by which the largely male "university elite" increased apparent similarities between themselves and their also largely male, and also professionalizing, university colleagues and decreased the actual similarities that existed at the turn of the century between themselves and their largely female, non-university colleagues. The result, quite obviously, was not a linear advance toward professional status, but rather the segmentation of sociology into a "profession" and a "semi-profession," a related, less autonomous group without its own body of theory, its function being to test and apply the theories of the profession to which it related.¹⁸ Even the name attached to this "semi-profession"—social work—indicates that the relationship was akin to that of management and labor.

Within this alternative conception of the history of professionalization in sociology, Jane Addams's criticisms of "the scholar" become interesting, not merely as abstract observations or even as projections from her own education, but also as signs of a prescient dissent from trends that would redefine who she was and how Hull House would be seen, trends that were manifest even before 1905 within the field she knew best, the field of sociology. Could it be, then, that Addams's comments about the trends she worried about in higher education indicated an awareness that professionalization would result in segmentation and therefore in a narrowing of sphere for settlement workers like herself? And could it also be that she feared that the separation of theory and practice through professionalization would transform Hull House and other settlements from sociological laboratories into mere data gathering stations, or worse, into charity centers that dispensed aid and "adjusted" individuals without attempting to study and interpret the causes of dependency and the need for general social reform?

Those possibilities do not seem at all implausible, and pursuit of them would require research that could be fruitful in considering the segmentation of sociology and other human service fields as they professionalized. The splitting of sociology into a largely male "profession" and a largely female "semi-profession" fits a pattern also evident in the professionalization of medicine and education.

Recent work in nursing history and the history of medicine suggests, for example, that the development of nursing as a "semi-profession" facilitated the further professionalization of doctors. As therapeutic techniques requiring extended, antiseptic care were developed after the Civil War, doctors needed clean, well-managed settings in which to apply the new knowledge and to effect better cures, in the process gaining greater respect and professional standing. Hospitals could not serve as such settings, however, until nursing was transformed from a largely janitorial occupation requiring no formal training, an occupation that, in Susan Reverby's words, attracted "the dregs of female society—women who mainly drank themselves into oblivion to endure their thankless and wretched labors of cleaning, feeding, and watching over the hospital's inmates," into one that could attract "proper," moral, middle-class women as a result of educational opportunities, decent working conditions, and an aura of respectability.¹⁹ Clearly, therefore, the development of hospital training schools for nurses (there were no such schools in the United States in 1870 and over 2000 of them in 1920), which facilitated this transformation, was causatively related to the transformation of hospitals from charity homes for the sick poor into temporary treatment centers for people of all social classes. Both transformations were causatively related to the further professionalization of doctors. There is truth in the old adage that doctors could cure because nurses cared.²⁰

In education, segmentation also occurred at roughly the same time. As Myra H. Strober and David Tyack have argued, the feminization of teaching facilitated the emergence of a distinct group of mostly male principals and supervisors, especially in urban areas.²¹ Beyond that, there may also have been a segmenting process introduced as teachers' institutes gave way to professional schools of education, where specialized psychological, administrative, curricular, and pedagogical knowledge could be developed and transmitted to those who would apply it in practice in the schools.²² Once again, although study of professionalization in education is not yet as well advanced as study of professionalization in medicine and the related health fields, it does seem that the existence of a largely female "sub-professional" practitioner group facilitated the development of "professional" training institutions, job categories, and even sciences.

As Joan Jacobs Brumberg and Nancy Tomes have argued in "Women in the Professions: A Research Agenda for American Historians," a brilliant essay that appeared in *Reviews in American History*, evidence from medicine, education, and a number of other fields suggests that professionalization cannot be understood without comparative studies across professional domains. "Only by charting the development of women's fields in relation to one another, as well as to the male-dominated fields, can we begin to comprehend the interconnections

between sex roles and the occupational structure," they maintained.²³ Pursuing the bases for Addams's concern with developments in higher education would not only build on that insight, in the process adding academic sociology to Brumberg and Tomes's linkage of "social work" to public administration; it would also combine with Brumberg and Tomes's insight the need to focus on participant perceptions.

Professionalization represented a means of organizing work through the subdivision and parcelling out of different jobs and statuses between and among different groups and institutions. It was neither an inevitable nor an impersonal, "objective" sociological process caused solely by an advancing division of labor. It was rather a human and, in both Addams's and Merriam's sense, a political process that can only be fully understood, first, if patterns of assertion, resistance, and accommodation are analyzed along with changes in knowledge and technology, and, second, if questions of social class and perhaps race are considered along with gender issues. As Brumberg and Tomes correctly observed, gender was a critical "organizing principle" in the "structuring of women's participation in the professional workforce."²⁴ But its role and significance will remain elusive unless gender is considered amidst a full range of potentially important social and personal factors. Including a focus on participant perceptions could offer an initial point of entry into the variety of human interests or personal "stakes" that were variously involved.

What might one find, for example, if one compared the personal perceptions of three of the people importantly involved in the professionalization of sociology, the emergence of social work, and the redefinition of settlement work as a form of social work rather than sociology—Albion Small, Jane Addams, and Mary Richmond? Although I have alluded above to the exclusion from sociology of female practitioners and suggested that this may have facilitated the organization of social work as a "semi-profession," the drive toward professionalization among charity workers led by Mary Richmond was also an important contributing factor. It is intriguing, therefore, that with the exception of gender, Addams was at least superficially more like Albion Small socially than she was like Mary Richmond—she was Protestant, not Catholic; and, at a time when it was still unusual, especially for a woman, she was college educated. Comparative study of how these three people understood the occupational changes that were so important to their lives and careers could therefore be helpful in beginning to isolate the ways in which social class affiliation interacted with gender in the shaping of occupational goals and self-definitions. Such a study could not yield instantly generalizable conclusions, but could point to the questions that need to be asked to reach such conclusions.

The two research possibilities I have briefly sketched—studying Addams's writings not as personal documents but as social commentaries, indeed, as important works of sociology; and relating Addams's views of scholarship and the university to the contemporary reconfiguration of "social science"—are important, I think. But in the end their greatest value may lie in recalling the continuing potential of study of Addams. Relative to many other "notable" women, she has, of course, been extensively analyzed. And yet, because she was a complex and multi-faceted person who lived during a time of fundamental change, there are still ample opportunities for further fruitful research. Jane Addams challenged American society more than it was ready to acknowledge, and that challenge still exists for historians to scrutinize.

NOTES

1. Jane Addams, "A Function of Social Settlements," *Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science* 13 (1899): 323-345, and "Recent Immigration: A Field Neglected by the Scholar," *Educational Review* 29 (1905), pp. 245-263, are examples.
2. Jane Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull-House* (New York: Macmillan, 1910), pp. 12-13.
3. Jane Addams, "Bread Givers," *Rockford Daily Register*, April 21, 1880, reprinted in *Jane Addams: A Centennial Reader* (New York: Macmillan, 1960), pp. 103-104; and Jane Addams's senior essay as quoted in Allen F. Davis, *American Heroine: The Life and Legend of Jane Addams* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 22.
4. Jane Addams, "Bread Givers."
5. Quoted in James Weber Linn, *Jane Addams: A Biography* (New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1935), pp. 22-23.
6. Jane Addams, *Democracy and Social Ethics* (New York: Macmillan, 1902). For a full listing of Addams's writing see Helen M. Perkins, comp., *A Preliminary Checklist for a Bibliography of Jane Addams* (Rockford, Ill.: Jane Addams Centennial Committee, 1960).
7. Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, "Jane Addams: An Educational Biography," in *Jane Addams on Education*, Classics in Education No. 51 (New York: Teachers College Press, 1985), pp. 1-48.
8. Both reviews are quoted in Davis, *American Heroine*, p. 128.
9. Charles E. Merriam, *A History of Political Theories* (New York: Macmillan, 1903). A recent analysis of some of Hull House's political activities is Kathryn Kish Sklar, "Hull House in the 1890s: A Community of Women Reformers," *Signs* 10 (1985), pp. 658-677.
10. Addams, "Recent Immigration," pp. 246-247.

11. Albion W. Small, "Fifty Years of Sociology in the United States (1865-1915)," *American Journal of Sociology* 21 (1916), pp. 784-785.
12. Mary O. Furner, *Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865-1905* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1975), p. 312.
13. Mary Jo Deegan, "Early Women Sociologists and the American Sociological Society: The Patterns of Exclusion and Participation," *American Sociologist* 16 (1981), p. 14.
14. Small, "Fifty Years," pp. 729 and 731.
15. "Introductory Note," *Journal of Social Science: Containing the Transactions of the American Social Science Association* 1 (1869), p. 3.
16. Small, "Fifty Years," p. 774.
17. On the ASSA both older works like L.L. Bernard and Jessie Bernard, *Origins of American Sociology: The Social Science Movement in the United States* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1943), and newer ones like Thomas L. Haskell, *The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth-Century Crisis of Authority* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977), are useful.
18. Among the many works on the structuring of labor markets that are relevant to the concept of segmentation I have found Peter B. Doeringer and Michael J. Piore, *Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis* (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1970), and Michael J. Piore, "On the Conceptualization of Labor Market Realities," in *Utilization of the Social Sciences in Policy Making in the United States: Case Studies* (Paris: OECD, 1980), pp. 67-95, especially helpful.
19. Susan Mokotoff Reverby, "The Nursing Disorder: A Critical History of the Hospital-Nursing Relationship, 1860-1945" (Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1982), p. 26.
20. Among the many works pertaining to the argument here are Jo Ann Ashley, *Hospitals, Paternalism, and the Role of the Nurse* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1976); Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, ed., *Nursing History: New Perspectives, New Potential* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1983); Barbara Melosh, "The Physician's Hand": *Work Culture and Conflict in American Nursing* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982); Jane E. Mottus, *New York Nightingales: The Emergence of the Nursing Profession at Bellerue and New York Hospital 1850-1920* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1981); Reverby, "The Nursing Disorder"; Paul Starr, *The Social Transformation of American Medicine* (New York: Basic Books, 1982); and Morris J. Vogel, *The Invention of the Modern Hospital: Boston 1870-1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).
21. Myra H. Strober and David Tyack, "Why Do Women Teach and Men Manage?" *Signs* (1980), pp. 494-503.
22. This certainly appears to have been an implicit concern of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in sponsoring a study entitled *The Professional Preparation of Teachers for American Public Schools* (1920). See Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, *Private Power for the Public Good: A History of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1983), pp. 86-89, 188-189.

23. Joan Jacobs Brumberg and Nancy Tomes, "Women in the Professions: A Research Agenda for American Historians," *Reviews in American History* 10 (1982), p. 287.

24. *Ibid.*

Education for Equality: Women's Rights Periodicals and Women's Higher Education, 1849-1920

PATRICIA SMITH BUTCHER

Trenton State College

TOO OFTEN HISTORIANS CHARACTERIZE America's first women's movement solely as a campaign for suffrage; that limited perspective is misleading.¹ A careful reading of the 1848 Declaration of Sentiments, issued at the Woman's Rights Convention (Seneca Falls, New York) demonstrates that its composers sought equal rights for women in all areas of life: social, economic, and legal, as well as political. The Declaration's charge "He has denied her the faculties for obtaining a thorough education, all colleges being closed against her" testifies that women viewed higher education as a mainstay in their quest for complete equality.

From 1849 to 1920, women's rights periodicals acted as forums for discussions about the injustices outlined in the Seneca Falls document. These publications promoted the message that equality could best be obtained by educated women. For more than seven decades the women's rights press insisted that women were physically and mentally capable of education, heralded the founding of educational institutions for women, championed coeducation, and contradicted opponents of women's educational aspirations.

The *Lily* (1849-1856), the first women's rights paper, made its initial appearance in Seneca Falls, six months after the convening of the Women's Rights Convention. Like its many successors, it was edited, written and published by women, and advocated that women should enjoy full participation in all aspects of life. Three other women's rights periodicals appeared in the ante-bellum years. Published first in Providence, Rhode Island and later in Boston, the *Una* (1853-1856) was more intellectual and theoretical than its Seneca Falls sister. Unlike the *Lily* and the *Una* whose audiences were middle class women, the *Woman's Advocate* (1855-1856?) from Philadelphia addressed itself to working class women. The *Sibyl* (1856-1864), published in Middletown, New York, was ostensibly a dress reform publication. However, because its editor boldly linked that campaign to freedom for women in general, the *Sibyl* is one of the early women's rights titles.

Following the Civil War, women's rights periodicals were more prolific, geographically diverse, and often more strident in their titles, than their ante-

bellum predecessors. The first women's rights title to appear after the Civil War was the *Revolution* (1868-1870), edited by Elizabeth Cady Stanton. Published in New York City, its masthead proclaimed "Men, their rights and nothing more; women, their rights and nothing less." Its outspoken tone on provocative topics made it unpopular among the more moderate supporters of women's rights. In 1870 the more conservative publication, the *Woman's Journal* (1870-1933) began publication in Boston with Lucy Stone as its editor.

Other papers of this period showed that the women's movement was moving westward. Chicago was the publication place of the *Agitator* (1869); the first western women's rights paper was the *Pioneer* (1869-1873); the *New Northwest* was published in Portland, Oregon from 1871 to 1887; Denver was the home of the *Queen Bee* (1882-1895), and the *Woman's Tribune* (1883-1909) began publication in Beatrice, Nebraska before moving to Washington, D.C. The south also produced a women's rights title, the *Woman's Chronicle* (1888-1893) published weekly in Little Rock, Arkansas.

Although all of the papers championed women's rights, each had distinctive traits. All took the form of a tabloid newspaper, but some, such as the *Queen Bee*, were as brief as four pages; others, such as the *Woman's Journal*, appeared as a twenty-four page weekly. Their life spans also differed. The *Agitator* lasted less than a year, while the *Woman's Journal*, founded in 1870, continued publication until 1933. Intended audiences also varied for each paper. The *Una* tried to attract the middle class intellectual while the *Woman's Advocate* and the *Pioneer* appealed to working women. The *Revolution* and the *Queen Bee* were radical in tone; while others, such as the *Lily*, the *Woman's Chronicle*, and the *Woman's Journal* were more moderate. The papers were as different as their editors' philosophies of women's rights. They did, however, agree on women's need for higher education. Nine of the twelve editors had been school teachers before embarking on journalism careers. Three attended an institution of higher learning. Lydia Sayer Hasbrouck, editor of the *Sibyl*, received an M.D. degree from a hydro-pathetic medical college; Lucy Stone, founder of the *Woman's Journal* was an Oberlin graduate; and Clara Bewick Colby, editor of the *Woman's Tribune*, was the University of Wisconsin's first female valedictorian.

In one of the early issues of the *Agitator*, editor Mary Livermore declared "Education is the very cornerstone of women's elevation."² Her sister editors concurred. With the goal of securing women's rights through education, the papers assumed a dual role. While countering opposition to women's higher education, they simultaneously bolstered women's confidence about their physical and mental abilities to succeed in colleges and universities. Testimonials by authority figures that education would destroy the delicate minds and bodies of women were a prominent feature of mid-nineteenth and early twentieth century

popular periodicals. Writing in 1873, amidst the furor caused by women's unrelenting efforts to achieve higher education, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, a New England intellectual and early champion of women's education, declared, "The higher education of woman is like one of Spenser's palaces in the 'Faerie Queen', that is guarded by a series of ghostly sentinels, all individually powerless as you approach, but collectively formidable to the imagination."³ For seventy-one years those "ghostly sentinels" formed a powerful wave of shifting yet constant opposition to women's education. The women's rights press was their main foe. In a world determined to restrict women's roles, ignore their talent, and belittle or condemn their successes, women's rights papers vigorously argued that higher education was women's right, and the foundation of their equality.

1849-1864

In the anti-bellum era, arguments against women's education contended that women were physically and mentally inferior to men. Dire predictions of education's ill effects on women's health abounded during this period, forcing female seminaries and early coeducational colleges to implement extensive programs to strengthen women's bodies as they developed their minds.⁴ Despite the outcry over the damaging effects of education on women's health, and efforts by educational institutions to alleviate the fears, women's rights periodicals ignored health arguments, and focused instead on establishing women's intellectual credentials.

Prevailing popular sentiment idealized women as passive, nurturing creatures whose talents were limited to the care of husband, children, and maintenance of the home. Intellectual prowess had no place in the life of a "true woman."⁵ Man was the doer and thinker, while woman was simply his handmaiden, lacking ambition or intellect of her own.

Disregard for women's intelligence was universal. In 1853, Horace Mann, then the First Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, succinctly captured the common sentiments on the differences between the sexes when he declared "His might is in muscles and logic; hers in fascination and pathos."⁶ Likeminded sentiments appeared in the textbooks of the period. Children learned to scorn higher education for women by being exposed to passages from popular texts. The Merriam reader, for one, asserted, "The female mind, in general, does not appear capable of attaining so high a degree of perfection in science as the male. . . . Nature, propriety, and custom have prescribed certain bounds to each; bounds which the prudent and candid will never attempt to break down."⁷

Aware that societal contempt for women's intellect was a major impediment to educational equality, early women's rights periodicals refuted charges that women were innately less intelligent than men, while bolstering women's perceptions of their talents. In an early issue of the *Lily* (1849-1856), editor Amelia Bloomer published an essay on "Woman's Intellectuality" by an anonymous female author. The piece criticized men for disdaining studious, thoughtful women while they ridiculed others as vain and foolish. Acknowledging the paucity of women intellectuals, the author asserted that women's ignorance was circumstantial, and not innate. She urged female readers to abandon their mindless, passive roles and aspire to the "rich treasures of intellect and knowledge."⁸

Elizabeth Cady Stanton, a regular columnist for the *Lily*, advanced the same theme with more asperity. Writing in an 1850 issue of the paper, she disparaged men's claims to intellectual superiority and asserted:

When we shall have had our own colleges, our professions, our trades for a century or so, a comparison may then be more justly instituted. When a woman, instead of being taxed to endow colleges where she is forbidden to enter, instead of forming societies to educate young men, shall first educate herself, where she shall be just to herself before she is generous to others, improving the talents God has given her, and leaving her neighbors to do the same for themselves, we shall not hear then so much of this boasted greatness.⁹

The *Una* (1853-1855) regarded women's intellect so highly that it printed an extended editorial on the subject in the periodical's second issue. Editor Pauline Wright Davis asked "How can the slumbering genius of our sex be awakened?" Praising women's genius as "omnipotent," Davis regaled readers with accounts of brilliant role models from the past such as the story of Milan's Agnesia Gaetan, who spoke and read Greek and Hebrew at the age of eleven, and became a professor at the University of Bologna.¹⁰

Edited by a woman doctor, the *Sibyl* (1856-1864) published articles deploring the scarcity of female intellectuals in American society. A reader from Brandon, Wisconsin complained that women learned only mindless domestic skills, but were capable of much more. She asserted that it was not "the design of our Heavenly Parent to make a difference in the intellect of the male and female children."¹¹ Another reader concurred, declaring "There is 'no Sex in mind,'" and added her own list of names to the honor role of accomplished women.¹²

The message provided in editorials, letters, and articles was the same. Women displayed less intelligence than men, but the deficiency was not innate. Society confined women's capacities by limiting them to purely domestic roles. Women's rights publications portrayed women's intellect as dormant rather than nonexistent. They offered plentiful examples of past women "greats" to inspire readers' confidence and to provoke imitation. Through their fervent refutations and morale boosting, women's rights periodicals of the era provided women with virtually the only confirmation they had concerning their minds and talents.

1865-1889

The post Civil War years witnessed an increase in the number of women attending college, and subsequently opposition to women's higher education intensified. Science gained its ascendancy in the years following the Civil War, and thus arguments employed to combat women's educational advances took on a more technical tone than those used in the ante-bellum years. Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* (1859) and Herbert Spencer's *The Principles of Biology* (1864) captured the American imagination. Analogies between society and biological organisms, known as "social Darwinism," became the bedrock of social thinking, including substantiation of ideas about female distinctiveness.¹³

Throughout this period, controversy over educated women's minds and bodies filled the pages of popular magazines and newspapers. Opposition to women's higher education gained new credibility and prominence because it employed highly regarded scientific facts. Some argued that women were physiologically incapable of learning, while others contended that extensive schooling would tamper with women's preordained social responsibility to bear and raise children. Women's rights papers continued their refutations. Arguments on women's intellect and health often treated both issues simultaneously; however, for the sake of clarity the response of the women's rights press on the mental and physical capacities of educated women will be discussed separately.

Women's Intellectual Abilities 1865-1889

The first post Civil War women's rights paper was the *Revolution* (1868-1870) edited by Elizabeth Cady Stanton. Stanton did not philosophize on the issue of women's intellect. Instead, her paper was a forum for readers to present their own accounts of "intellectual discrimination." In 1869 a woman student

who attended St. Lawrence University (Canton, New York) wrote to the *Revolution* saying that she had enrolled at the coeducational institution and had become the "best scholar in the sophomore class." In her rhetoric class, she asked the professor (who was also the college's president) to criticize her in the same manner that he used for the male students. He agreed but prefaced his comments on her speech with the remark, "Women labor under great disadvantages in endeavoring to become public speakers." Regarding his response as a slur against female intelligence, she called his remark "uncivil" and "an insult to all woman-kind." After circulating an essay detailing his insulting behavior, she was reprimanded and chose to resign from the college.¹⁴

In the pages of the *Agitator* (1869), the Chicago based paper edited by Mary Livermore, a letter from another student demonstrated that although colleges were coeducational, they continued to treat women students as inferiors. Anile, a student at Grinnell College (Grinnell, Iowa), informed the paper that the college had two literary societies, one for males and the other for females. During this era the college literary society, with its debates, disputations, and literary exercises, was viewed as the well-spring of campus intellect; the admission of women to the society would have been a public acknowledgement that the reasoning powers of the sexes were equal.¹⁵ At Grinnell women were also refused admission to some lectures; this too was a common occurrence because many academics regarded Greek and the sciences as incomprehensible and too sexually provocative for the female mind. Anile chafed against this disregard for women's intelligence, and informed readers that "God never intended women to be the 'weaker man' mentally!"¹⁶

Articles in the women's rights press demonstrated that women endured contempt and challenges to their role as students, even in the tolerant West where colleges had more easily adopted coeducation. In 1873 the *Pioneer* (1869-1873), published in San Francisco by Emily Pitt Stevens, reprinted an article from the *University Echo*, the University of California's student paper. Titled "About the Lady Students," it was purportedly authored by the University Chaplain. Alarmed at the presence of women students on the California campus whom he regarded as "out of their sphere," the author wistfully wrote, "How much more desirable to behold the fingers of woman busied with the knitting needles and stockings than in tracing the vain figures of geometry upon a blackboard." He then offered "rules" that male students should follow when encountering female classmates. Snubbing, staring, refusing them admission to literary societies, and speaking contemptuously of coeducation were some of the suggestions that he hoped would force women to abandon college classrooms.¹⁷ The reprint may have been a clever parody, but in light of the often outrageous

arguments against educated women, it more likely expressed deeply felt resentments.

The *Woman's Journal* (1870-1933) constantly challenged assaults against women's intellect. In 1874 Dr. Edward Clarke, a professor at the Harvard Medical School, and infamous among women's rights activists for his 1873 book *Sex in Education; Or a Fair Chance for the Girls*, authored a less sensational sequel called *The Building of a Brain* which demeaned women's intellect. Clarke contended that women were endowed with underdeveloped brains and could not tolerate the same educational stimuli given to men, "The organs whose normal growth and evolution lead up to the brain are not the same in men and women; consequently their brains, although alike in microscopic structure, have infused into them different, though excellent qualities."¹⁸ In her *Woman's Journal* review of Clarke's work, Antoinette Brown Blackwell criticized Clarke for being precipitous in his conclusions. Blackwell, a graduate of coeducational Oberlin, declared that it was wiser to rely upon an "obvious first principle, that women can no more need a different class of mental food than they can need a different style of beef, mutton, and vegetables . . . Let the sexes work together, to be a natural check and measure of each other, since Nature so evidently intended them to keep side by side."¹⁹

Clarke's work was an example of the applications of craniology, a science arguing that brain weight determined mental ability. This new "science" was a potent force in the late nineteenth century, and the popular press allotted it much space and credence.²⁰ In the July 1880 issue of the much-read *North American Review*, "The Ethics of Sex" by journalist M.A. Hardaker drew damning conclusions based on craniology about women's intellectual abilities.²¹ The *Woman's Journal* reprinted the article in which Hardaker, referring to her own sex, contended that "Small brains cannot give birth to great thoughts." She claimed that the most important sexual difference between men and women was the larger size, hence superior intellect, of the male brain. In the rebuttal, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, an associate editor of the paper, countered Hardaker's charges, and declared that "William Pitt ruled Europe, if my memory does not deceive me, with a head smaller than many a woman's."²²

When William Hammond, a distinguished nerve and brain specialist and a former U.S. Surgeon General, published his views on the topic they were reprinted by the *Woman's Journal*. Hammond was scathing in his assessment of women's intellect. Employing the popular theory of evolution, he concluded that woman's brain was different from that of man because she had different physical functions. Hammond declared that no matter how much education women received, they were incapable of the original or abstract thought needed to be a

legislator, judge, or leader of men. He concluded, "No great idea, no great invention, no great discovery in science or art, no great political, dramatic, or musical composition, has ever yet emanated from a woman's brain. There have been two or three second-rate female painters, and perhaps one first-rate female novelist, and when that is said, all is said."²³

To refute the barrage of scientifically based articles demeaning women's intellect, often authored by popular journalists or prominent individuals, the women's rights periodicals brimmed with references to women's academic success in college. To explain her paper's continual highlighting of women's accomplishments, Abigail Scott Duniway, editor of the *New Northwest* (1871-1887) of Portland, Oregon, wrote, "It is always the result of a long career of subjugation that those who have been reared under it have to be educated into self respect."²⁴

Her sister editors also recognized that women needed role models. Because society neither acknowledged nor publicized examples of educated women, the women's rights press provided readers with abundant examples of females who dared to attend college, were physically and mentally able to graduate, and were also named class valedictorians, holders of prizes, awards, and honors, outdoing the men students. The periodicals demonstrated to young women readers contemplating higher education that they should not be daunted by prescriptions on feminine health and intellect. Clara Colby, principal of a girl's institute in Memphis, Tennessee, wrote to the *Woman's Journal* that she read aloud from the periodical to her 300 students, generally choosing the "Concerning Women" column which noted the accomplishments of educated women. She informed the paper that "At the year's end, the effects are visible in stimulated ambition, a broader outlook, and a higher view of woman's possibilities."²⁵

By the 1890s, arguments about female brain size and stimulation receded from the national scene. Assertions, such as Harvard President Charles Eliot's (1897) that "It remains to be seen whether [the] higher faculties will be developed in as large a proportion in educated women as in educated men," a statement made in a generally eulogistic account of female academic accomplishments, became quite rare.²⁶ An 1892 editorial on "Brains" in *Woman's Journal* asserted women's indifference to the now infrequent charges.²⁷ The question lingered in the south and parts of the midwest; in 1892, editor Catherine Cunningham of the *Woman's Chronicle* (Little Rock, Arkansas, 1888-1893) warned her readers that they should regard articles on women's small brain size as "petrified specimens of antediluvian origin."²⁸

Women's Health 1865-1889

Although five of the women's rights periodicals of this era—the *Revolution*, the *Agitator*, the *Pioneer*, the *New Northwest*, and the *Queen Bee* published material upholding women's intellect, they said little about the health of educated women. The *Woman's Journal* however, adopted it as a major cause.

A testimonial that education did not impair women's health appeared in an early issue of the *Woman's Journal*. Edward Hitchcock, M.D., and professor of physical education at Amherst College, analyzed thirty years of student records from Mount Holyoke Seminary. He showed that during that period only 139 or 11.46% of its 1212 graduates had died. In his analysis of similar records for Amherst, Dartmouth, Yale, Bowdoin, Wesleyan, and Harvard Colleges, Hitchcock discovered that during that same period 1557 or 13.81% of their 11,123 graduates had died. Based on this finding, Hitchcock declared that college education was more harmful to males than to females.²⁹

Hitchcock's work did little to offset fears caused by Clarke's *Sex and Education*. Although Clarke acknowledged that women should be educated, he asserted "Identical education of the two sexes is a crime before God and humanity, that physiology protests against, and that experience weeps over."³⁰ In 1908, thirty-five years after the publication of *Sex in Education*, M. Carey Thomas, president of Bryn Mawr College, recalled the doubts that Clarke's findings had cast on women's ability to succeed in college. Thomas remarked that women college students and graduates "were haunted in those days by the clanging chains of that gloomy little specter, Dr. Edward H. Clarke's *Sex in Education*."³¹

The *Woman's Journal* denounced the book as a polemic and published material to show that Clarke's devastating findings were based on scant evidence. Higginson was relentless in pointing out the book's flaws. In early 1873 he acknowledged the doctor's medical expertise, but stated that Clarke had failed to make a strong connection between ill health and study. Higginson concluded that in every college some students withdrew because of illness. He noted that in his own Harvard class, a young man had left for health reasons. Higginson then ended with an interesting piece of news: "It may not be improper to add, that it was my good friend, Dr. Clarke himself."³²

Higginson even journeyed to Vassar College to ascertain the facts on "Miss D," one of Clarke's famous case studies. According to Clarke, "Miss D," entered Vassar a healthy young woman at age fourteen, but after three years of study was physically underdeveloped, pale, hysterical, and plagued with fainting spells and headaches. Although "Miss D" graduated at eighteen, four years after her entrance, her ill health continued.³³ After questioning both Vassar's president and

the resident physician about the case, Higginson reported to *Woman's Journal* readers that both individuals stated that no such instance of precocity and ill health had ever occurred at their institution.⁵⁴

Additional evidence about the good health of college women came from Anna Dickinson, a prominent women's rights activist and lecturer, Dickinson attended the 1874 commencement at the University of Michigan which graduated the class containing the institution's first female freshmen. She informed *Woman's Journal* readers that the young women graduates were as "healthy and happy as a troop of milkmaids." She noticed "no lack of feminine grace," no signs of "breaking down" nor any "sallow, cadaverous visages."⁵⁵ For a number of years following, in even the most general articles on college women, references to their physical appearance detailed their glowing cheeks, hearty appetites, physical prowess, and happy, serene attitudes.

From material in the *Woman's Journal* it is evident that the popular press took ghoulish pleasure in reporting the deaths of women college students or graduates. The *Woman's Journal* devoted painstaking attention to setting straight the facts of such deaths. In 1879 the death of a twenty year old New York City school teacher evoked concern in the popular press. The teacher, Gertrude Greenwood, had attended Mount Holyoke Seminary briefly but left the school before receiving her degree. She died a few months after beginning her teaching career. The popular press attributed her death to strain caused by overstudy. The *Woman's Journal* countered that Greenwood's death had no connection with her brief attendance at Mount Holyoke.⁵⁶ A month later two letters printed in the *Woman's Journal* made the same point. Greenwood's sister related that the young woman had been sickly for a number of years prior to attending the Seminary, and that her time there did not exacerbate her condition. The librarian of Mount Holyoke defended her institution's academic program, stating that the students took only two courses at a time and recited in each only four times a week.⁵⁷

This fascination over the deaths of college-educated women did not cease, and in 1888 the *Woman's Journal*, displaying its exasperation with the morbid tendencies of the popular press, declared, "When a woman who has taken honors at college dies within twenty years of her graduation, her death is always attributed to the higher education, even if she dies of smallpox."⁵⁸

In 1888 an aging Lucy Stone reported on a meeting of the Council of Educators, an association of presidents of prominent colleges. At a session on "The Dangers and Benefits of Women's Higher Education," several college presidents testified about the health and physical activities of their women students and graduates. President L. Clark Seelye of Smith College reported that over 350 women had graduated from his college over the past ten years, and only

three of them were dead, and he noted that their deaths "were not related to higher education." After dutifully reporting the group's generally positive findings on college women's health, Stone commented wearily, "After fifty years of successful coeducation and higher education for women at Oberlin and similar results at Ann Arbor, Cornell, and other colleges, it seems late in the day to have these questions raised."³⁹ Yet the battle over educated women's health spilled over into the following decades, when society held college women responsible for endangering the progress of American civilization because they married later and had smaller families.

1890-1920

In 1890 over 56,000 women enrolled in some form of higher education, at commencement ceremonies that year, 2,682 women received bachelor's degrees. These figures should have been tangible proof that women had both the physical and mental stamina to compete with male college students.⁴⁰ Controversy over college women's health waned, and the women's rights periodicals no longer expended any effort denying charges based on ill health. However, as old specters diminished or disappeared, new ones rose to take their place. During this period the most prominent argument against educated women was the charge of "race suicide" which rose from intense concern about women college graduates' low marriage and birth rates.

Women's Marriage and Birth Rate 1890-1920

Concern about the low marriage and birth rates of college women, a topic of some concern since the 1880s, peaked during the first decade of the twentieth century, when prominent figures linked birth rate to national vigor. Three related trends fueled charges of "race suicide": public awareness of the declining native American birth rate, a large increase in immigration, and an interest in eugenics, a biological science devoted to improvement of the human species, founded by a British biologist, Sir Francis Galton, a cousin of Charles Darwin.

The decline in the native American birth rate, and fears that the floods of immigrants had produced the adverse social and economic conditions plaguing the cities commingled with ideas of eugenics to create criticism of native born white women for not marrying or for having fewer children. Although all women were suspect, the attacks singled out college-educated women as the prime

scapegoats. Society publicly chastised them for their refusal to acknowledge by their behavior that woman's ultimate goal was to be a good wife and mother.

As in past decades, critics used scientific evidence that college-educated women married less frequently, had fewer children, and were endangering the well-being of the nation. Three major studies on the marriage and birth rate of college educated women appeared in the 1900s, and received much attention in the popular press. The findings of all three were remarkably consistent: Only half of the women graduating from college in the 1880s and 1890s (who ranged in age from 32 to 52 at the time of the studies) married. The average number of children for the college-educated mother was 2.5, and since approximately 20% of married college women remained childless, the average number of children per married woman fell to about two, while in the population at large, the figure was 3.56 children per married woman.⁴¹

In addition to those well-publicized studies, articles in the popular press and statements by President Theodore Roosevelt himself created a nationwide frenzy about college women's refusal to recognize their moral and social obligations to marry and produce children.⁴² Despite the fact that society attacked college women's motives and personal lives, women of all backgrounds and educational levels gave birth to fewer children.⁴³ The public ignored the overall decline among all women and focused on the decline among college-educated women.

As usual, when critics attacked college-educated women, the women's rights press responded. The periodicals mounted a powerful counteroffensive to combat the charges of "race suicide." In 1891 the *Woman's Chronicle* noted that the public condemned educated women for their lack of attention to maternal duties. The article discounted such charges saying, in what became a typical response from the women's rights press, that although educated women produced fewer children, they were better children. Admitting that college women married less frequently, the paper declared such marriages "more prudently made."⁴⁴

In 1903 the *Woman's Tribune* published an article by Lucinda Chandler, founder of Boston's Moral Education Society, whose mission was to promote "enlightened" parenthood. In the article she noted the concern of President Roosevelt and Harvard's President Eliot about the decline of marriage and motherhood among college-educated women.⁴⁵ Chandler acknowledged that both men were influential public figures, but she defended the right of college women to make their own decisions. Claiming that college instilled high standards for marriage and motherhood, she concluded, "The world does not need multiplication of numbers as much as better material for perfecting manhood and motherhood. If a more or less clear perception of this results in fewer marriages

and fewer children among college educated women, it is only to be regretted that every girl could not be college educated."⁴⁶

In 1906 the *Woman's Journal* published a revealing excerpt from the annual report of President Seelye of Smith College. Seelye, referring to Eliot's claim, forthrightly stated: "Higher Education does not unfit women for marriage and maternity." The Smith president chastised Eliot, Roosevelt, and G. Stanley Hall who declared publicly that women should be educated solely for maternal duties. Seelye asserted, "A woman does not become masculine by studying mathematics any more than a man becomes feminine by writing poetry, and it would prove a serious defect in the higher education of women if it were shaped merely with reference to a particular vocation."⁴⁷

None of the women's rights papers denied that college women married less and had fewer children; instead they argued that choices about marriage and motherhood were woman's private right. Deftly adopting the rhetoric of the eugenics movement, the women's rights press contended that higher education helped women to make less hasty, wiser marriages and enabled them to raise healthier, happier children.

Conclusion

The "ghostly sentinels" barring women's advances in higher education were formidable and long-lasting. Public sentiment tenaciously maintained women's second-class status by attempting to confine women to the parlor and nursery. Colleges and universities attempted to deny women entrance on the grounds that they were physically and mentally incapable of academic pursuits.⁴⁸

Prior to the Civil War, opposition to women's education centered around hazy generalizations about women's lesser intellectual abilities. In the postwar years, as women more vigorously demanded and achieved higher educational opportunities, previously vague arguments hardened into serious rationalizations based on medical and biological findings. Three major issues surfaced: women's health would suffer; they were incapable of learning because of small brain size; and intellectual pursuits would deter them from marital and maternal responsibilities.

Medical doctors, scientists, and popular writers were regarded as authoritative spokespersons. Lacing their writing with scientific jargon, they warned women that serious academic work would destroy both their minds and bodies. The evidence was powerful and frightening. Awesome scientific and medical language embellished case studies and imbued all conclusions with a powerful veracity. To counter the formidable sentinels guarding higher education from

women, the women's rights press launched its own battle to lay claim to women's right to and capacity for higher education. Determined that women would not be passive, timorous victims of a society intent on disparaging their intellect and belittling their bodies, the women's rights press challenged, ridiculed, and denied all charges against women's ability to succeed in higher education. As society employed science to rationalize and legitimize the distinctions between the sexes, the women's rights periodicals met the opposition face to face. The women's rights press informed readers that women did have intellects and that they were capable of attaining a college degree. Entire articles or excerpts from prominent opponents to women's higher education were reprinted, and adjacent to them, stirring rebuttals. Speeches, studies, and reports from doctors and scientists who labored to disprove women's lesser mental and physical capacities appeared. Readers were inundated with accounts of intellectual female role models, first drawn from history, but later from the growing ranks of successful college women.

In its role as propagandist for women's equal intellectual and physical capacities, the women's rights press presented scientific evidence and spokespersons who claimed that women could succeed in college, and who punctured the bombast of the opponents with their own terminology. Against daunting and ever-shifting arguments, the women's rights press conveyed much needed information bolstering women's claims to higher education. Over time, through sheer numbers and deeds, women demonstrated that they deserved an equal place in higher education. Although the sentinels were powerful and enduring, they proved to be ultimately ineffective against women's fierce desire to attain higher education and the indomitable support of the women's rights press. For seventy-one years women's rights papers served as a mirror and mold of women's struggle for higher education. Written by women, for women, these publications showed that women's higher education was the cornerstone of their equality.

NOTES

1. Major histories of the women's rights movement which emphasized suffrage goals are Eleanor Flexner, *Century of Struggle: The Woman's Rights Movement in the United States* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1959; New York: Atheneum, 1971); Aileen Kradt, *Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement 1890-1920* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965); William L. O'Neill, *Everyone Was Brave: History of Feminism in America* (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1971); Anne F. Scott and Andrew Scott, *One Half of the People: The Fight for Woman Suffrage* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1975); and Ellen DuBois, *Feminism and Suffrage: The*

Emergence of an Independent Women's Movement in America 1848-1869 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978). More recent histories discuss the wider interests of the women's rights movement. See for example, William Leach, *True Love and Perfect Union: The Feminist Reform of Sex and Society* (New York: Basic Books, 1980); Mari Jo Buhle, *Women and American Socialism, 1870-1920* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1981); and Elisabeth Griffith, *In Her Own Right: The Life of Elizabeth Cady Stanton* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984).

2. *Agitator*, May 1, 1869, p. 5.
3. Thomas Higginson, "Higher Education of Woman," in *The Liberal Education of Woman: The Demand and the Method*, ed. James Orton (New York: A.S. Barnes & Company, 1873), p. 309.
4. Thomas Woody, *A History of Women's Education in the United States* (New York: Science Press, 1929. Reprint. New York: Octagon Press, 1966), vol. 2, pp. 98-117.
5. Barbara Welter, "Anti-Intellectualism and the American Woman: 1800-1860," *Mid-America* 48 (October, 1966), pp. 258-270.
6. Horace Mann, *A Few Thoughts on the Powers and Duties of Woman* (Syracuse: Hall, Mills, and Company, 1853), p. 25.
7. Charles Merriam, *The Intelligent Reader* (Springfield, Massachusetts: C. Merriam, 1835), p. 127. Cited in Ruth Elson, *Guardians of Tradition: Schoolbooks of the Nineteenth Century* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), p. 310.
8. *Lily*, August 1, 1849, p. 61.
9. *Lily*, February, 1850, p. 12.
10. *Una*, March 1, 1853, pp. 24-26.
11. *Sibyl*, October 15, 1857, p. 251.
12. *Sibyl*, October 1, 1859, p. 629.
13. For a discussion on the impact of Darwin and Spencer see Richard Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought*, rev. ed. (New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1959). Unfortunately the book makes no specific references to sex roles.
14. *Revolution*, January 14, 1869, pp. 19-20.
15. Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University: A History* (New York: Knopf, 1968), pp. 137-146.
16. *Agitator*, September 11, 1869, p. 4.
17. *Pioneer*, May 1, 1873, p. 4.
18. Edward H. Clarke, *The Building of a Brain* (Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1874), p. 20.
19. *Woman's Journal*, December 12, 1874, p. 1.

20. For a discussion on the use of craniology see Stephen Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man* (New York: Norton, 1981), pp. 73-112. For specific references to how the study was used to discredit women's intellect see Elizabeth Fee, "Nineteenth Century Craniology: the Study of the Female Skull," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 53 (Fall, 1979), pp. 415-433; for the British applications of the science to women's intellect see Joan Burstyn, *Victorian Education and the Ideal of Womanhood* (Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes & Noble Books, 1980), pp. 77-80.
21. M.A. Hardaker, "The Ethics of Sex," *North American Review* 131 (July, 1880), pp. 62-74.
22. *Woman's Journal*, July 3, 1880, p. 209.
23. *Woman's Journal*, August 4, 1883, p. 242.
24. *New Northwest*, February 20, 1874, p. 1.
25. *Woman's Journal*, November 7, 1891, p. 356.
26. *Woman's Journal*, July 3, 1897, p. 216.
27. *Woman's Journal*, August 20, 1892, p. 270.
28. *Woman's Chronicle*, February 27, 1892, p. 1.
29. *Woman's Journal*, May 21, 1870, p. 155.
30. Edward H. Clarke, *Sex in Education: Or A Fair Chance For The Girls* (Boston: James R. Osgood & Co, 1873), p. 127.
31. M. Carey Thomas, "Present Tendencies in Women's College and University Education," *Educational Review* 25 (February, 1908), p. 68.
32. *Woman's Journal*, January 18, 1873, p. 17.
33. Clarke, *Sex in Education*, pp. 79-87.
34. *Woman's Journal*, November 15, 1873, p. 361.
35. *Woman's Journal*, July 4, 1874, p. 214.
36. *Woman's Journal*, September 6, 1879, p. 288. Even the normally staid *New York Times* headlined Greenwood's obituary with the caption "Death From Overstudy" and reported that she suffered from "brain exhaustion" and died from intense "intellectual work." See *New York Times*, August 27, 1879, p. 5.
37. *Woman's Journal*, October 4, 1879, p. 316.
38. *Woman's Journal*, March 10, 1888, p. 75.
39. *Woman's Journal*, July 14, 1888, p. 222.
40. U.S. Census Bureau, *Historical Statistics of the United States*, p. 386.
41. G. Stanley Hall and Theodate L. Smith, "Marriage and Fecundity of College Men and Women," *The Pedagogical Seminary* 10 (September, 1903), pp. 275-314; Amy Hewes, "Marital and

- Occupational Statistics of Graduates of Mount Holyoke College," *Publications of the American Statistical Association* 12 (December, 1911), pp. 771-796; and Mary Van Kleeck, "A Census of College Women," *Journal of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae* 11 (May, 1918), pp. 557-591.
42. Theodore Roosevelt, *The Foes of Our Own Household* (New York: George Doran Company, 1917), pp. 250-272; Frances Abbott, "College Women and Matrimony Again," *Century* 51 (March, 1896), pp. 796-798; A. Laphorn Smith, "Higher Education of Women and Race Suicide," *Popular Science* 66 (March, 1905), pp. 466-473; and Charles Emerick, "College Women and Race Suicide," *Political Science Quarterly* 24 (June, 1909), pp. 269-283.
 43. Carl Degler used the "total fertility rate," the average number of children borne by a woman by the time she reaches menopause, to show that the fertility of white women in the U.S. fell 50% from 1800 to 1900, from 7.04 children per woman in 1800 to 3.56 children per woman in 1900. See Degler, *At Odds: Women and the Family in America From the Revolution to the Present* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), p. 181.
 44. *Woman's Chronicle*, October 10, 1891, p. 1.
 45. See Roosevelt, *Foes*, pp. 250-272; and Charles Eliot, "President's Report for 1901-1902," *Annual Reports of the President and Treasurer of Harvard College, 1901-1902* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1903), pp. 31-32.
 46. *Woman's Tribune*, February 28, 1903, p. 21.
 47. *Woman's Journal*, February 3, 1906, p. 19.
 48. For an analysis of British opposition to women's higher education during the Victorian era see Burstyn, *Victorian Education*. In addition to arguments from medicine and science, Burstyn presents those from economics and religion, two areas which the American women's rights press did not address.

The Turning Point in American Jesuit Higher Education: The Standardization Controversy Between the Jesuits and the North Central Association, 1915-1940¹

LESTER F. GOODCHILD

DePaul University

TO REDRESS THE ANOMALIES of the nineteenth century American college, the federal government, private associations, and philanthropic foundations devised various plans by the turn of the century to encourage greater uniformity among institutions of higher learning. During the next twenty years, the most successful approaches came from the Association of American Universities (AAU) and the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (NCA). They introduced modern collegiate standards and certified whether member institutions conformed. Most public and private universities or colleges joined these associations or other regional accrediting bodies because they reflected or enhanced their own missions, policies, and practices.

However, Catholic university and college educators faced ideological and practical problems with these new mandates for American higher education. In particular, the Society of Jesus which enrolled 38,200 students at its 26 institutions of higher learning in 1921 confronted a perplexing dilemma.² To what extent, if at all, should its colleges and universities adopt these American standards? Such an accommodation threatened to alter substantially their historic governance structure, three century old *Ratio Studiorum*, and professional preparation of clerical faculty, all of which constituted the distinctive character of the Jesuit educational apostolate in the United States.

This controversy raged among American Jesuits until the Second World War, during which Jesuit universities and colleges adopted the NCA's standards and affiliated with the association. This turning point in American Jesuit higher education changed its governance structure, collegiate mission, faculty caliber, and curricular offerings. As a result, Jesuit universities and colleges embarked on an Americanization course which brought them into the mainstream of American higher education during the past twenty years.³

To reveal the dynamics of this controversy, this paper describes how the complex relations between the NCA and midwestern Jesuit higher education

from 1915 to 1940 affected the development of Loyola University of Chicago. Chartered in 1870 as St. Ignatius College, this Jesuit men's college exemplified how the NCA influenced not only Loyola's own evolution toward American university stature but also the eight other midwestern Jesuit universities and colleges in the Missouri Province.⁴ This inference is possible because of the highly centralized and coordinated structure of the Society's educational apostolates. Following the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus, the governance of higher education operated on three levels. The superior general who resided in Rome administered all Jesuit colleges and universities through regional superiors, i.e., provincials, and local superiors, i.e., rector-presidents of educational institutions.⁵ Furthermore, when American Jesuit educators began national boards to coordinate their activities, their universities and colleges became a cohesive educational system. The story of Loyola University thus discloses how new American ideas, institutions, and social forces changed significantly the historic educational philosophy and practice of Jesuit higher education which comprises the largest group of private institutions in American higher education.⁶

This controversy is explored by tracing the beginnings of the accrediting associations and the initial Catholic response, by delineating the three stages of the standardization controversy and its effects on Loyola University of Chicago, and by evaluating the importance of these developments for American Jesuit higher education.

I.

During the latter part of the nineteenth century, the diverse practices of universities, colleges, academies, and high schools created great confusion about the nature of American higher education. To alleviate this problem, reform efforts arose. As early as 1870, the United States Bureau of Education published a list of collegiate institutions which conferred baccalaureate degrees.⁷ By 1886, the bureau established quality rankings when it differentiated some women's colleges which were not "organized upon the usual plan of arts colleges."⁸ While these listings provided a comprehensive enumeration of such institutions, the bureau's hope to improve the quality of their education never materialized. Greater strides in achieving uniformity among collegiate institutions occurred through the development of national associations, such as, the National Association of State Universities in 1896, the Association of Catholic Colleges in 1899, the Association of American Universities in 1900, and the Association of Land-Grant Colleges in 1900.⁹ They intended to impose common standards on collegiate institutions by regulating their internal policies. Introducing a third approach, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching offered charitable contributions to those institutions which maintained certain high standards, namely

requiring students to complete at least fourteen units of high school credit for admission, employing six or more full-time professors, offering a four-year liberal arts and science course, and attaining a \$200,000 endowment.¹⁰ By 1906, it selected forty-five colleges to receive this funding; other institutions revised their policies to become similarly eligible. This foundation thus succeeded in bringing about the most immediate changes within American colleges.

However, the associations produced longer lasting results. The National Association of State Universities met with representatives from four recently-organized regional associations, such as, the NCA, in 1906 to "present a plan . . . for establishing, preserving, and interpreting in common terms standards for admission to college . . ."¹¹ The group resolved not only this issue but also decided to create common standards for colleges during its day and a half meeting. This development launched the *standardization* movement, which later became known as *accreditation*. By 1909, the NCA formulated standards for its future affiliated colleges and universities. During the next year, the association established procedures for evaluating its member institutions. In 1911, an event determined which of the three agencies encouraging American college standards would assume the task. The AAU asked the Bureau of Education to rank colleges and universities in the United States according to their quality. After its effort leaked to the press, the bureau received such strong protests from college and university presidents that it suppressed publication of its five-tiered classification.¹² As a result, the bureau ceased its efforts to create national standards. Subsequently, the AAU began this task, although it concentrated on universities.¹³ The AAU limited its focus to these institutions, because the NCA developed a viable organization for the prescription of new American collegiate standards in the Midwest.

Having established its spheres of influence, the NCA set the pace for the other three regional accrediting associations and midwestern institutions of higher learning. In 1913, it published its first list of standards for affiliated member colleges: (1) a student's admission depended upon the completion of 14 units of high school credit; (2) the conferral of the baccalaureate required 120 collegiate credits; (3) an acceptable course of studies comprised 8 departments; (4) faculty members needed a master of arts or doctor of philosophy degree, with the head of each department held by a terminally-degreed faculty member; and (5) faculty instruction should not exceed between 15 and 18 hours per semester.¹⁴ With this adoption, NCA member institutions offered their students approved degrees which enabled them to enroll in AAU-affiliated university graduate and professional programs. Furthermore, such institutional recognition prompted philanthropic foundations to grant greater financial support. On the other hand, non-affiliated colleges jeopardized their academic reputations, limited their

graduates' further study, and undermined their future development.

These events forced American Catholic higher educators to develop their own standards, since most of their institutions could not meet the NCA standards. While Georgetown College had opened as the first Catholic institution of higher learning in 1789, the state of Catholic higher education by the turn of the twentieth century found Catholic institutions struggling to differentiate their secondary and collegiate programs as they moved from their six-year Continental secondary-collegiate programs to the four-year American college pattern. Yet, significant advances had occurred. Catholic institutions, such as Georgetown, St. Louis, Notre Dame, and Fordham, had been thriving colleges for more than fifty years and had been experimenting with graduate studies for at least twenty-five.¹⁵ The Jesuits operated three of these five institutions. Furthermore, Catholic University of America, established by the American bishops as a graduate institution in 1889, represented the flagship of Catholic higher education as a charter member of the AAU. Attempting to coordinate these three levels of Catholic higher education, the Catholic Educational Association (CEA)—which had replaced the Association of Catholic Colleges in 1904—established guidelines for its members in 1915. It patterned them after the NCA standards: 16 high school units for admission, 128 credit hours for graduation (the 8 hours in addition to the NCA list allowed for religious courses during the four years), 7 departments within the college, a baccalaureate degree for the faculty, and 16 teaching hours maximum for faculty instruction per semester. The greatest disparity between these standards acknowledged the deficient Catholic faculty training which had resulted from a large preponderance of foreign clergy. In actuality, the CEA formulated these standards to demonstrate its *intention* to promote quality. Its lenient certification allowed Catholic colleges to gain CEA affiliation as most Catholic colleges could not meet its standards. There is little evidence to suggest the CEA would have done this without the NCA action. The CEA thus provided an organizational credential for Catholic universities and colleges.

On the other hand, some Catholic colleges and universities under the leadership of more modern religious educators had marshalled their resources sufficiently to meet the NCA standards. The University of Notre Dame affiliated with the NCA as a charter member in 1913 under the enlightened leadership of Provincial John Zahm, C.S.C. and President John W. Cavanaugh, C.S.C. They had little fear that NCA affiliation would compromise the Congregation of Holy Cross's governance or educational philosophy at Notre Dame. Undoubtedly, Zahm and Cavanaugh believed this association strengthened Notre Dame's academic reputation. Their action demonstrated Notre Dame's historic propensity to adopt American innovations in higher education.

However, the Jesuits failed to apply for NCA membership or institute CEA recommendations. Many factors contributed to their resistance. Concerning the NCA affiliation, the Jesuits rejected the aegis of a non-Catholic association. They believed this action jeopardized the historic mission, governance structure, *Ratio Studiorum*, and faculty preparation of the Society's educational apostolate. The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus also prohibited any external regulation of Jesuit colleges and universities. Yet, American Jesuits soon realized they had progressively less choice in this matter. There were several reasons. Other NCA-approved Catholic and non-Catholic institutions grew faster than Jesuit colleges. Notre Dame registered 360 arts and letters students within its 1,000 enrollment by 1920. Conversely, Loyola University in Chicago had only 124 such students within its 2,200 enrollment. Other midwestern non-Jesuit Catholic colleges also provided greater curricular flexibility. Notre Dame offered five baccalaureate programs with variations from the classical course to different science concentrations. On the other hand, St. Ignatius College offered only the 1832 *Ratio Studiorum* classical course—the most recent revision of its 1599 predecessors—with its predominant Greek and Latin concentrations. Furthermore, students at other Catholic colleges needed only 128 hours to graduate, while the Jesuit course entailed approximately 140 hours. Catholic students also realized that admission to graduate studies at AAU-recognized universities depended upon their graduation from an NCA institution. While the Jesuits realized the seriousness of these problems, something more crucial than the issues of control, enrollments, curricular flexibility, or student access to graduate education worried them in the initial heat of this controversy: the very survival of the *Ratio Studiorum* in the United States.

II.

The first stage of the standardization controversy thus concerned whether or not midwestern Jesuit educators would revise their curriculum to accommodate the changing realities within American Catholic higher education. The Jesuits needed to reorganize their curriculum to compete more favorably with other Catholic colleges which met NCA standards. However, dismantling the historic concentrations of the *Ratio* and imposing departmental structures could not be undertaken by individual Jesuit institutions. Permission for such changes could be granted only by the Society's superior general.¹⁶ Furthermore, these adaptations required the coordination of all Jesuit institutions throughout the four American provinces. This process took five years.

To understand the radical nature of these changes, an analysis of the turn of the century American Jesuit college and its curriculum is needed. "The Aim of College Education" in the *Catalogue of St. Ignatius College, 1902-1903* emphasized the nineteenth century concepts of religion, mental discipline, and cultural refinement. These ideas furthered the Jesuit apostolic mission to develop Christian leaders through education. Jesuit administrators contended their curriculum laid a broad and solid course for subsequent specialized or professional studies. They rejected electivism and resisted departmental structuring for they believed such practices undermined the humanistic ideals of Jesuit education.¹⁷

The Jesuit single baccalaureate degree program consisted of language, philosophy, and science courses, structured with Catholic content (see table 1). There were several reasons for this. First, St. Ignatius College's course continued the Counter-Reformation *pietas litterata* tradition with its Christian literature orientation, reinforced by the 1828 Yale Report and Newman's *The Idea of a University*.¹⁸ Second, its philosophical concentration enabled students who intended to study for the priesthood to receive the necessary training before beginning theological studies at a seminary. Known as a *collegium mixtum*, this college offered specialized philosophical and classical studies for students entering clerical, professional, or commercial occupations which the Catholic bishops had approved at the Third Plenary Council in 1884.¹⁹ Third, a central part of this curriculum entailed religion classes and moral training. Religion classes taught students basic Catholic dogma, doctrine, and morality twice weekly. Besides this, the Jesuits required Catholic students "to be present at the Chapel exercises, to make an annual retreat, and to approach the Sacraments at least once a month."²⁰ Maintaining the secondary character of Catholic education during the nineteenth century, these chapel exercises required Catholic students to attend *daily* Mass until 1917.²¹ In this manner, the Jesuit educational apostolate tightly intertwined educational and religious mandates:

... the Jesuit System does not share the delusion of those who seem to imagine that education, understood as an enriching and stimulating part of the intellectual faculties, has of itself a morally elevating influence in human life. ... Religion alone can purify the heart and guide and strengthen the will. This being the case, the Jesuit System aims at developing side by side the moral and intellectual faculties of the student, and sending forth into the world men of sound judgment, of acute and rounded intellect, of upright and manly conscience. It maintains, that, to be effective, morality is to be taught continuously;

it must be the underlying base, the vital force supporting and animating the whole organic structure of education.²²

This historic fusion soon faced multiple challenges.

Although the Chicago Jesuit community had resisted changing the college, its new leadership launched the institution on a university course during the first decade of the twentieth century. In 1904, President Henry J. Dumbach, S.J. (1858-1909) purchased land to expand St. Ignatius's collegiate program on the north side of Chicago. Partial instruction began in 1913. President Alexander J. Burrowes, S.J. (1853-1927) rechartered the college as Loyola University in 1909—just as he had done at Marquette University in 1907—after being challenged by another Chicago Catholic college which became a university, allowing Jesuit alumni to begin a law school, and receiving several requests from free-standing medical schools for university affiliation. Burrowes represented the midwestern progressive Jesuit who enabled the Society's colleges to appropriate some of the developments within American higher education. The major reason for this expansion here and at other Jesuit colleges came from the increasing demand of Catholic students who wished professional education, but found difficulty in gaining admission to non-Catholic professional schools. In this way, Burrowes hoped to establish a "Jesuit university of high rank."²³ The Jesuits thus moved away from such American collegiate models as Amherst, Oberlin, and Swarthmore.

While Loyola University with its professional schools grew, the college stagnated because Burrowes could not change the curriculum with its religious dimension. Indeed, its educational and religious curricular design and intense religious discipline made it unappealing to graduates from local Catholic academies and high schools. In the 1912-1913 school year, Loyola's undergraduate liberal arts course with its 47 students comprised less than ten percent of the 647 student body.²⁴

TABLE 1

ST. IGNATIUS COLLEGE BACHELOR OF ARTS COURSE, 1907-1908

Class Year and Classes ^a	First Semester	Second Semester
Freshman:		
Latin (5) ^b	Cicero, Virgil, Horace, Christian poets	Cicero, Horace, Livy, Christian writers
Greek (4)	Basil, Homer	Homer, Lyric Poets

English (4)	Literary Analysis	Lyric and Epic Poetry
History (2)	Papacy and Empire	Rise of the Papacy
Mathematics (4)	Plane Trigonometry	Spherical Trigonometry
Science (5)	Chemistry I	Chemistry II
Elocution (1)	Analysis/Interpretation	(same)
Religion (2)		
Elective	German, French	
Sophomore:		
Philosophy (4)	(none)	Dialects & Applied Logic
Latin (5)	Cicero, Horace, Epistles, Tacitus	Cicero, Juvenal, Tacitus
Greek (4)	Demosthenes, Chrysostom	Demosthenes, Sophocles
English (4)	Theory of Rhetoric, Rhetorical Analysis, History and Criticism	American Literature
History (2)	History of Religious Revolution	Renaissance
Mathematics (4)	Algebra	Algebra
Sciences (5)	Physics I	Physics II
Elocution (1)	Oratorical and Dramatic Selections	(same)
Religion (2)		
Elective	German, French	
Junior:		
Philosophy (5)	General Metaphysics/ Cosmology	Psychology
Latin (2)	Cicero, Plautus	Cicero, Terence
Greek (2)	Euripides, Hecuba or Medea	Herodotus, Thucydides
English (2)	English Literature	French Literature
History (2)	Philosophy of History, Nature and General Laws of History	Political Economy
Mathematics (5)	Astronomy	Analytical Geometry
Elocution (1)	Public Speaking and Debate	(same)
Civics (1)		
Religion (2)		
Elective		
Science (5)	Chemistry, Physics, Biology	(same)
Mathematics		
Languages	German, French	

Senior:

Philosophy (5)	Natural Theology/Ethics	Ethics
Latin (2)	Cicero, Seneca	Church Fathers
Greek (2)	Aristophanes	Plato
English (2)	Dramatic Literature	Dramatic Literature
History (2)	History of Philosophy	History of Philosophy
Mathematics	Calculus	
Religion (2)		
Elective (5)		
Science		
Math		
Languages	German, French	

Source: *Catalogue of St. Ignatius College, 1907-1908*, pp. 13-22, IUCA.

^aThis course of studies began during the 1880s and continued at the institution until 1920.

^bThe numbers inside the parentheses indicate the numbers of hours per week that the class was held.

The Jesuits took radical steps to improve collegiate enrollment at Loyola and their other colleges and universities in the Midwest. The first move came when Jesuit prefects of studies who supervised the academic affairs of these institutions met at St. Louis in July 1916 to discuss the changing conditions in American colleges and their meager enrollments. As a result, they asked Missouri Provincial Alexander J. Burrowes, who had been appointed by the general two years earlier, to form a regular committee to standardize the curriculum in their high schools and colleges.²⁵ In response to their request, he called a meeting of the rector-presidents of the nine Missouri universities and colleges in April 1917. The presidents focused most of their attention on declining enrollments. They suggested five causes:

(1) undue length of college course in general; (2) lack of variety in the courses offered; (3) insistence on Greek; (4) influence of professional schools in admitting students: either without preliminary college work at all or with only one or two years of such work; and (5) prevalence of the commercial and money-making spirit and diminishing esteem for college education.²⁶

Four of these problems would be eliminated, if they abided by NCA standards. One of their many solutions to these problems included this mandate. The provincial wanted a greater consensus.

To obtain this, Burrowes called the prefects of studies and the presidents to a meeting at Campion College in Wisconsin during April 1919.²⁷ The assembly concurred with the problems identified at the 1917 meeting and proposed many recommendations for the general in Rome. Six of these had significant implications for the future of Jesuit higher education. First, the Jesuits claimed their low college enrollments could be remedied by allowing greater variety and flexibility in their curriculum and by separating physically their high schools and colleges. Second, they requested all colleges to affiliate with the NCA or the AAU. Such a mandate required extensive changes in the Jesuit curriculum. Third, to accomplish this, they established a curriculum committee to suggest ways of (1) adopting major and minor concentrations, (2), revising their curricular nomenclature to follow other American public and private institutions of higher learning, and (3) shortening the length of the collegiate curriculum to 120 hours for graduation. Their fourth and fifth recommendations suggested ways to achieve this curricular reduction. They decided to eliminate a significant part of the *Ratio* by asking the general to drop Greek as a requirement for the baccalaureate degree. The Jesuits also wanted to reduce the number of hours in philosophy to a minimum of six semester hours, because the *collegium mixtum* college was no longer necessary with the rise of diocesan high school and collegiate seminaries. Finally, sixth, they wanted one of the Missouri province universities to establish a graduate department for Jesuit seminarians who could take specialized studies, perhaps leading to the doctorate.²⁸ These resolutions determined the policies at Jesuit universities and colleges for the next twenty years.

The provincial committee on curriculum developed a plan to implement the radical resolutions of the 1919 assembly. Chaired by John B. Furay, S.J. (1873-1952), the fourteenth president of Loyola University, with Albert C. Fox, S.J. (1878-1934), the rector of Campion College, as its secretary, the committee advocated a tremendous change in the American *Ratio Studiorum* by July: 128 hours for graduation similar to other Catholic colleges as suggested by the CEA and mandated by the NCA. To accomplish this, Furay and Fox made extensive course reductions in the 138 hour Jesuit collegiate curriculum to allow for a major-minor sequence and electives. They eliminated 58 required course hours by dropping Greek and reducing Latin which were crucial elements of the *pietas litterata* curriculum. On the other hand, they dropped only 10 philosophy hours rather than the 20 suggested by the assembly. Since this subject represented a traditional way of teaching Christian ideas and dogma, especially through the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas, the Jesuits retained a strong philosophy concentration as a means to promote their apostolic purpose in operating institutions of higher learning. The curriculum would change in the following way:

Subject	Hours Now Required	Hours Recommended
Latin	22	16
Greek	16	0
English	38	12
History	6	6
Mathematics	6	6
Science	16	16
Philosophy	26	16
Religion	8	8
Total	138	80 ²⁹

Their proposal drastically revised the Jesuit *Ratio* and dismantled the philosophical concentrations endemic to the *collegium mixtum* pattern of the nineteenth century American Catholic college.

On July 31, 1919, the new Missouri provincial, Francis X. McMenamy, S.J. (1872-1949), informed the Jesuit presidents that Superior General Włodimir Ledochowski (1886-1942) had approved their recommendations. They could confer the baccalaureate degree without Greek.³⁰ When McMenamy distributed the final collegiate curriculum revision a year later, his remarks pointed to a new age in Jesuit higher education which embodied elements from American higher education: "... the newly drafted collegiate curriculum, preserving, as it does, the substance of the *Ratio* while it interprets our traditional system in the terms of current educational procedure, may under God be the harbinger of a new season of prosperity and growth for the college departments of the Province."³¹ The first stage of the standardization controversy thus had ended in favor of accommodation to American influences emanating from the NCA. The Jesuit *Ratio* had taken on a distinct American design.

III.

While the general had approved the Missouri province proposals, other Jesuit and Catholic presidents resisted this movement toward affiliation with the regional accrediting bodies. They hoped to use the CEA as *the* standardizing agency for Catholic higher education.³² The second stage of the standardization controversy centered on this dilemma. Again, Albert Fox played the key role in convincing other Catholic educators to acquiesce to the accrediting agencies. Elected president of the CEA's department of colleges and secondary schools in 1920, Fox held a commanding position to promote this sentiment. He revealed

his rationale for this belief in his invitation to member institutions for the spring 1920 meeting of the CEA. He stated that Catholic colleges were being assailed correctly for their poor condition. To overcome this, Fox called on Catholic educators:

... to obtain official authoritatively final recognition of the fact that ours are truly standard American colleges and universally admitted to be such not only by the Catholic, but also and especially by the non-Catholic college world in America. We owe this in strict justice to our students and their families who have continued until now to give us their time, their money and their confidence without any thought or fear of being penalized for their loyalty later on when they seek admission to professional and other advanced courses in secular institutions of learning.⁵⁵

Fox's argument stressed the need to demonstrate the quality of Catholic higher education and the mandate of social justice.

At the next CEA conference in 1921, Fox redoubled his efforts to sway the Catholic higher education leadership. He presented a paper justifying the need of CEA member institutions to attain accreditation.

Never was the Catholic college that is as truly a college as it is Catholic, more needed than it is in this day and hour. Never was it more imperative for us to impress upon the educators and laymen of the country at large that our standards are the best and the highest, natural and supernatural, human and divine; ... Never was it more distinctly our duty to exert ourselves to the utmost that is in us, determined never to rest until we have proven conclusively to the doubters within that our institutions of higher education are not the less Catholic because they are colleges, and to the cynics without that they are none the less colleges because they are Catholic.⁵⁶

Moreover, Fox organized a panel of speakers who presented the major forces for standardization. He invited Kendrick C. Babcock who had created the Bureau of Education's 1911-1912 quality rankings and George F. Zook who was the current specialist in these matters at the bureau. Both authors presented strong justifications for accreditation with astute awareness and sensitivity to the difficulties

Catholic institutions would have in implementing these standards. Fox's efforts largely succeeded during the 1920s as more Jesuit and Catholic institutions applied and received membership within the standardizing agencies. Recognition of his work came in June 1928 when President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University presented Fox with an honorary doctorate and noted his "large influence in the movement to raise the standards and improve the methods of college and university work throughout the United States, easily taking rank with the foremost educational leaders of the land."⁵⁵ Fox's efforts had broken the isolationism of Catholic higher education which had begun during the mid-nineteenth century.

Meanwhile, the 1919 Missouri province assembly had pointed the way for Jesuit higher education in the rest of the country. It was the precursor for the Inter-Province Committee on Studies which constituted the first in a series of national Jesuit governance structures to coordinate the internal policies of Jesuit educational institutions in the face of extensive external pressures during most of the twentieth century.⁵⁶ At the first meeting of the committee in June 1921, the presidents elected Fox as their chairman, discussed their enrollment crisis, and argued about the demands of the accrediting agencies. They also endorsed the resolutions of the 1917 and 1919 Missouri province committee meetings for the entire Jesuit system: (1) the creation of a committee on studies of each province, (2) the separation of the college and the high schools wherever possible, and (3) the need to standardize their collegiate and high school courses.⁵⁷ These recommendations became the new mandate for Jesuit higher education in the United States. When the Inter-Province Committee sent its recommendations which the American Jesuit provincials endorsed to General Ledochowski, he gladly approved them, since problems with the American Jesuit schools had been recognized for some time at the generalate. Furthermore, Ledochowski stipulated that the committee's role was only advisory. Following the Jesuit constitutions, he prohibited the committee or the provincials from approving "any innovation in the collegiate plan of studies without the approval of the Superior General."⁵⁸

With these developments, the Chicago Jesuits instituted the norms from the 1919 provincial meeting of presidents and prefects. President John Furay implemented the curricular changes by the 1920-1921 school year.⁵⁹ The introduction of the so-called Latin-English degree and its expanded course offering became the best means for Jesuit colleges to overcome their enrollment problems. In the following year, he gained NCA accreditation for Loyola.⁶⁰ Next, Furay reunited both college programs on the north side of Chicago in the 1922-1923 school year, a little over twenty years after the initial suggestion to move the college.⁶¹ These actions produced the long-desired results. While the World War

I Strategic Army Training Corps program inflated the student body between 1917 and 1919, the post-war collegiate enrollments declined to a low of only 123 students by the 1921-1922 school year. The next fall, the Reverend William H. Agnew, S.J. (1881-1931), the fifteenth president of Loyola University, saw Loyola's enrollment dramatically increase to 270, a growth of over 100 students from the previous year. Other Jesuit institutions recorded similar improvements throughout the Missouri province.

After the first two stages of the standardization controversy, the Jesuits had revised their curriculum and changed their governance structure to allow a non-Catholic agency to mandate internal policies for their universities and colleges. While the Jesuits had occasionally revised their *Ratio* during its three hundred years, they had never made such radical curricular changes nor allowed such external intervention. The price for making these historic moves would soon be realized.

IV.

As members of the NCA, Jesuit institutions now had to follow its recommendations and norms. This twenty year adjustment represented the third stage of the standardization controversy between the Missouri and Chicago province Jesuits and the NCA.⁴² It involved struggles over the training of Jesuit faculties, the apostolic mission of their colleges, and the adequacy of their financial resources. The first shock came in 1923 when the NCA revised its requirements for faculty training.

The minimum scholastic requirement of all teachers shall be graduation from a college belonging to this association, or the equivalent. The training of the members of the faculty of professorial rank shall include at least two years of study in their respective fields of teaching in a recognized graduate school, presumably including the Master's degree. For heads of departments, training should be equivalent to that required for the Ph.D. degree or should represent corresponding professional or technological training.⁴³

Jesuit universities similar to other Catholic institutions had difficulty conforming with these standards, because few Jesuits had academic doctorates but rather ecclesiastical degrees, such as, a licentiate or doctorate in sacred theology.⁴⁴ Where would these faculty come from? In response, the Inter-Province Committee took steps to upgrade Jesuit training. At its 1923 meeting, the committee

encouraged the provincials to allow Jesuits to study for the doctorate, which also reinforced a mandate of the *Ratio Studiorum* to develop preeminent faculty.⁴⁵ To meet the first NCA site inspections in the short-term, the 1924 meeting of the Inter-Province Committee called upon Jesuit presidents to hire lay Catholic doctoral faculty.⁴⁶ The provincials approved these recommendations.⁴⁷ Their urgency stemmed from a desire to avoid an unfavorable NCA report.

Ideally, Jesuit administrations wanted to award their own doctorates to Catholics who understood the Jesuit apostolate. Therefore, they began or revised their graduate degree requirements to meet those recommended by the standardizing agencies. In December 1925, the presidents and the prefects of study of the Missouri province established the minimum graduate standards for faculty training, the character of graduate courses, the requirements for the awarding of master of arts and doctoral degrees, the administration of graduate schools, and the necessary facilities for graduate study.⁴⁸ In this sense, the NCA requirements for faculty professionalization forced Jesuit institutions to establish graduate and doctoral programs prematurely to obtain Catholics for their faculties. Such external prescriptions changed the type of faculty which the Jesuit educational apostolate would employ in the United States. These recommendations thus laid the foundation for the most significant institutional reassessment of the American Jesuit university mission.

During the first two decades of the twentieth century, Jesuit educational leaders followed what they perceived to be the traditional European structure of a university, namely, the addition of professional schools to a strong Jesuit college. They did this to meet the needs of their Catholic clientele and to train Catholic leaders in the professions. They eschewed the German model of graduate research with its disinterested inquiry orientation, which American universities had emulated since the 1870s. This ideal stressed the discovery of knowledge with little concern about its religious ramifications. Jesuits resisted this approach because it conflicted with their apostolic educational mission. As Jesuit institutions came under the direction of accrediting agencies composed of the most stalwart proponents of the German model, Jesuit administrations were compelled to adopt some aspects of this modern American university mission. No greater specific demarcation of this change can be noted than the recommendation of the June 1926 Inter-Province Committee meeting to follow NCA and AAU norms.

No university is considered complete without a Graduate School, which should be organized and conducted according to approved standards. The courses offered should be of graduate caliber, and should be explicitly described in the

university catalogue. Not less than one year's work (30 semester hours) should be prescribed for a master's degree, and not less than two years additional for the doctorate.⁴⁹

The graduate school rather than the undergraduate college thus became the new focus within the Jesuit university. This launched the research aim of Jesuit universities—and the means to train Catholic faculty.

The Jesuit plan for graduate schools did not merely replicate those of non-Catholic American private and public universities. Jesuit leaders intended to conform these new appendages to their historic apostolic purpose. The Inter-Province Committee pointed to the new Jesuit graduate focus at its 1927 New Orleans meeting.

1. Our educational aim in general being the dissemination of Catholic doctrine and in particular the development of Catholic leaders, our program of educational endeavor in the United States has always included either directly or indirectly all schools from the lowest to the highest. While recognizing that preference be given to high school and college development because of a greater spiritual good ordinarily to be obtained from undergraduate education, we cannot but recognize also that the Graduate School, particularly in our own day, has assumed special importance and therefore should be developed in proportion to its relative value in the gaining of our spiritual object.

2. It is well known that the necessity of such graduate schools is constantly on the increase, for the reason largely if not mainly that in our Catholic graduate schools alone can the false philosophies which permeate non-Catholic graduate schools be combated. The development of our high schools and colleges calls for a growing number of Catholic lay teachers, who must be equipped with a graduate degree. If they obtain these degrees from secular universities, we can never be certain of the accuracy of their knowledge or their attitude concerning mooted questions of ethics and psychology. It is therefore imperative that the training of such lay teachers be provided for and received in Catholic universities.⁵⁰

The provincials realized the crucial importance of these graduate schools as a place "where Catholic teachers can be formed and our own scholastics and Fathers equipped for teaching, lecturing and administrative work in our

schools."⁵¹ Without such Catholic professionals, Jesuit universities would be forced to hire terminally-degreed faculty from non-Catholic universities who could not be counted on to be sympathetic to the form and manner of Jesuit graduate instruction—as will be described shortly. In this way, the 1923 NCA mandate changed the mission and faculty caliber of American Jesuit higher education. These largely external mandates determined the developments at Loyola University.

Its Jesuit administration moved quickly to implement these policies. As early as the 1925-1926 school year, President William H. Agnew, S.J. asked Austin G. Schmidt, S.J. (1883-1960) who had earned a doctorate from the School of Education at the University of Michigan to establish Loyola's graduate school. Hoping to make Loyola a great Catholic university, Schmidt believed strengthening graduate studies *and* inaugurating the doctorate remained crucial to Loyola's future university status. Having moved beyond the president's request, Schmidt received Agnew's approval to gain the support for both efforts from significant NCA members, since the NCA has begun to evaluate the graduate education of its member institutions by the late 1920s. First, Schmidt gained the endorsement of Charles Hubbard Judd, dean of the Department of Education at the University of Chicago. Next, he received support from Joseph D. Elliff, president of the NCA, and Raymond M. Hughes, president of Miami University. With these approbations, the dean believed that he could proceed with the strengthening of Loyola's master of arts degree programs and the inauguration of the doctorate. Schmidt assumed that "we shall be certain of the sympathetic co-operation of the North Central Association, . . . [and] build up the Graduate School, slowly perhaps, but in a solid and substantial manner which will attract more and more students."⁵²

At the meeting of the Graduate Council on January 14, 1927, Schmidt described his decision and actions to its members.⁵³ After much discussion, the council approved the Department of Education to award the doctorate and required departments which awarded master of arts degrees to have two doctoral and two graduate degreed faculty members.⁵⁴ These and other policies complied with NCA and AAU standards. Schmidt also created graduate courses for both degree sequences as well as policies regulating comprehensive exams, French and German proficiency exams, and a completed dissertation for the doctorate.⁵⁵ The Jesuit administration implemented these graduate degree requirements during the following year. After the first, doctoral oral examinations in May 1928, Loyola University awarded its first doctoral degrees to a Catholic layman and a religious brother.⁵⁶ This success thus helped to develop the Catholic intellectual leadership which Jesuit provincials, presidents, and deans wanted for Catholic higher education and their own universities.⁵⁷

However, Schmidt's move provoked problems and did not provide enough Catholic terminally-degreed faculty. While the NCA informally approved Loyola's graduate school, it still lacked formal AAU approval which was the sole accrediting agency for graduate schools. Moreover, the AAU resisted expanding its membership. Yet, the Inter-Province Committee asked Jesuit universities to obtain AAU accreditation in 1929 to establish quality programs and to enable their graduates to teach "in the accredited schools of certain Regional Associations."⁵⁸ This desire had a practical urgency; the committee reminded the Jesuit presidents that no Jesuit institutions were:

... meeting the Standard of most Regional Associations which require every faculty member of professorial rank to have had two years of specialized graduate study at an accredited Graduate School in the branch he is teaching and the Heads of Departments to hold Ph.D. Degrees from accredited Graduate Schools. Failure to remedy this condition is endangering the membership of these colleges in their respective Regional Associations.⁵⁹

The difficulty in meeting the NCA demands for more terminally-degreed faculty had put Jesuit higher education in a *standardizing double bind*. Jesuit presidents could not find enough qualified Catholic faculty. Nor did they have the funds to establish AAU-accredited graduate schools for training Catholic faculty or to offer scholarships to attract Catholic graduate students. This problem plagued Loyola and other Jesuit universities for another ten years until the AAU allowed the NCA to accredit doctoral programs.

Another factor made these standards even more difficult to meet. General Ledochowski called for a greater Catholic character *and* a greater academic quality within American Jesuit institutions. Responding to a Vatican charge that American Jesuit colleges were no longer Catholic, the general required Jesuit universities to strengthen their Catholic characters by hiring only Catholic faculty and by removing non-Catholics from dean and faculty positions. Moreover, he discouraged the enrollment of non-Catholic students. Thus, he wanted Jesuits to compete with other American universities and colleges but in a Catholic way.⁶⁰ Several years later, he also charged the American provincials in a letter of December 8, 1930 to "take a more influential share in determining the intellectual policy of the country."⁶¹ He called upon Jesuit institutions of higher learning to develop a united purpose and join in a concerted action to excel beyond their completing institutions. In this way, the general required Jesuit presidents to meet or exceed the NCA standards in what became called "The Catholic Way."⁶²

This triple bind hampered Jesuit universities until the worst effects of the Depression subsided.

This national economic disaster inhibited Loyola University's efforts to conform with the NCA standards and the general's instructions. Indeed, its doctoral program was in shambles only three years after Loyola granted its first degrees. By the spring of 1931, its Graduate Council charged that the Department of Education's courses lacked doctoral character; indeed, most resembled normal school classes. While some members of the council discussed abandoning the degree, they chose to strengthen the course by adding one or two additional professors, after several members informed Schmidt that Loyola University constituted the only Catholic university in the Midwest able to grant doctoral degrees in education.⁶⁵ When Schmidt informed President Robert M. Kelley, S.J. (1877-1953), the sixteenth president of Loyola University, of the graduate school's difficulties, the president endorsed his recommendations, even though they went against his own opinions.⁶⁴

Kelley believed Loyola's graduate programs failed to maintain the primary religious and moral purposes of Jesuit education, namely, "the salvation and religious and moral perfection of students."⁶⁵ This sentiment underscored Ledochowski's recent mandates and conformed to the older notion of the Jesuit apostolate which centered on the small collegiate design. He believed this, even though Dean Schmidt had made extensive efforts to integrate Jesuit apostolic aims within Loyola's graduate and doctoral programs. In response to a 1931 questionnaire from the Roman Congregation of Seminaries and Universities, Schmidt described how the graduate school fostered Catholic beliefs:

3. What means are used to win over the non-Catholic to Catholic belief and practice? Answer: (1) The crucifix and religious pictures are on the walls of our school. (2) The library contains Catholic books. (3) There is a book-rack with pamphlets on Catholic doctrine. (4) The spirit of Catholicism in the professors manifests itself. (5) Printed material issued by the university is circulated among the students. (6) Although non-Catholics are not required to take courses in apologetics, they must take certain courses in ethics, psychology, and sociology in which the Catholic view is presented. (7) There are occasional lectures on Catholic topics. (8) Influence is exerted during the conferences between students and their advisors.⁶⁶

Moreover, Kelley questioned the quality of Jesuit graduate programs: "we have plunged into graduate school work unprepared both academically and finan-

cially; . . . our policy in this matter has seriously injured our reputation in the United States as educators."⁶⁷ His assessment pointed to the forced origins of Catholic graduate and doctoral programs: "Graduate schools in theory had as their purpose primarily to discover new truths or to present new aspects of known truths to graduate students to make them Christian scholars. Practically speaking, the purpose was to meet the requirements of standardizing bodies particularly to qualify teachers."⁶⁸

Nevertheless, Kelley supported the Graduate Council's recommendations to strengthen graduate programs. He approved the offering of the doctorate in the Department of History in 1932, although Loyola granted none for six years. During the following year, he instituted standard teaching loads for faculty at 15 hours per week for lower division undergraduate faculty, 12 hours per week for upper division undergraduate faculty, and 10 hours per week for graduate faculty.⁶⁹ Allowing for greater research time among graduate faculty, this standard had been implemented within graduate schools of elite American universities since the turn of the century.⁷⁰ Furthermore, he doubled the number of doctorally-degreed faculty members during his administration from nine to fourteen in 1933 (see table 2). His efforts raised the quality of Loyola's graduate school which offered the master of arts in eight disciplines and the doctor of philosophy in education and history.⁷¹ By the end of Kelley's administration, three other education doctorates had been awarded (see table 3). Thus, Schmidt's decision to begin the doctorate had been supported by the next presidential administration. By 1933, the Jesuit administration at Loyola University had established the research aim within its institutional mission. Its experience represented the typical picture of new Jesuit universities, while the graduate and doctoral degree granting powers in 26 departments at AAU-affiliated Catholic University of America and in 44 departments at St. Louis University exemplified the strongest Catholic institutions. During the 1920s, the Jesuit administrations' adherence to the NCA regulations improved their faculties and launched their doctoral programs. All this was in response to an external agency and not the superior general of the society.

Besides meeting NCA faculty and graduate school standards, the Jesuit institutions of the Missouri province also faced new standards for their endowments and the number of doctoral granting departments necessary to be classified as a university. Each caused revisions in Loyola's governance structure and doctoral degree programs.

The movement to standardize Jesuit colleges had created new pressures within Catholic higher education. While major Catholic universities, such as the University of Notre Dame, St. Louis University, Loyola University, and DePaul University, had received NCA approval by 1925 because they had the resources to

fulfill its standards, this did not happen at many smaller Catholic colleges, especially those for religious women which educated the teachers for the growing primary and secondary Catholic school system. They lacked similar resources. Jesuit educational leaders hoped to assist these institutions so that their graduates could receive accredited degrees between 1925 and 1930 by suggesting an ingenious approach called the corporate college plan. The large Jesuit universities sought to affiliate or merge with smaller, local Catholic colleges, although there were different reasons and relationships for this development in each city. In 1925, St. Louis University signed an agreement which brought about a merger with nine other Catholic colleges. While this merger left the institutions independent corporately and financially, it established an Administrative Board consisting of the archbishop, president of St. Louis University, and two representatives from each college. This board made coordinating recommendations concerning governance, faculty, curriculum, and degrees for all the institutions to the Jesuit president of St. Louis University who had the final approval or veto. This plan enabled the corporate colleges to use the university's resources and to offer its accredited degrees. Moreover, this agreement had the NCA's approval which hoped that the Jesuit university could insure that the number, teaching, and content of the courses offered at the corporate colleges conformed to its standards.⁷² A similar plan under the sponsorship of the Right Reverend Joseph Schrembs, the bishop of Cleveland, with Albert C. Fox, S.J. as its regent, linked John Carroll University with four Catholic colleges and four Catholic nursing schools in 1929. In commenting on this plan, Fox perceived this arrangement as a way to unite the scattered forces in Catholic higher education. He hoped such a plan would be considered by Catholic educators in other cities.⁷³

TABLE 2

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY GRADUATE FACULTY DEGREE STATUS
FOR SCHOOL YEARS 1931 TO 1937

School Year	B.A.	M.A.	M.S.	Ph.D.	S.T.D.	Total
1931-1932	3	23	1	9	1	37
1932-1933	1	4	1	14	1	21
1933-1934	1	7	1	16	1	26
1934-1935	2	27	2	19	1	51
1935-1936	5	22	2	31	1	61
1936-1937	3	26	3	38	2	72

Source: "Graduate School Statistics," Box 3, File 49: Graduate Studies, JH-LUCA.

TABLE 3

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CONFERRAL OF DOCTORAL DEGREES
FOR SCHOOL YEARS 1928 TO 1940

School Year	Education	Chemistry	History	Philosophy	Total
1928-1929	2	0	0	0	2
1929-1930	1	0	0	0	1
1930-1931	1	0	0	0	1
1931-1932	1	0	0	0	1
1932-1933	0	0	0	0	0
1933-1934	0	0	0	0	0
1934-1935	1	0	0	0	1
1935-1936	1	0	0	0	1
1936-1937	2	0	0	0	2
1937-1938	0	0	0	0	0
1938-1939	0	0	1	1	2
1939-1940	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	9	1	4	2	16

Source: Office of the Registrar, "Degrees Conferred by the Professional and Graduate Divisions by Year and by Curriculum, 1923-1964," Box 2: Registration and Records, LUCA.

In the meantime, the NCA encouraged these mergers when it made new demands for actual endowments at Catholic institutions after 1928 and until 1935. Initially, the NCA had allowed Catholic institutions to count the unpaid salaries of their clerical faculties as a "living endowment." However, the 1928 NCA *proposed* standard replicated the AAU's endowment guidelines.⁵⁴ This posed such an immediate threat to the status of Catholic institutions that Jesuit provincials allowed presidents to create advisory boards of lay trustees for fund raising.⁵⁵ After Loyola's commerce dean suggested establishing such a board, Kelley announced the creation of the Administrative Council in 1930, which comprised nine prominent Catholic businessmen of Chicago, such as Stuyvesant Peabody, Edward A. Cudahy, Jr., and Samuel Insull, Jr.⁵⁶ Loyola's Council of Regents and Deans described the problem in this way:

It would appear as though the North Central Association has committed itself to a policy of reducing the number of colleges in the United States and of forcing out of existence

those that do not measure up. . . . It should be borne in mind that accrediting by the North Central Association is a question of life and death [to Loyola University] . . . Conditions which may cause difficulty are the following: (1) inadequate endowment, (2) athletic scholarships, (3) sharing library and academic equipment with the academy, (4) inadequate faculty preparation, (5) excessive teaching loads, and (6) excessive size of classes."⁷⁷

Kelley turned these problems over to his Administrative Council in June 1930.

Chairman Peabody suggested Loyola University consider consolidating the Chicago Catholic institutions of higher education. In this way, they might coordinate their efforts in raising an endowment sufficient to satisfy the NCA demands. He believed some \$20 million might be raised over ten years. The members then suggested that Kelley seek Cardinal George Mundelein's approval.⁷⁸ At the next meeting of the council, Kelley reported that Mundelein endorsed the consolidation. Unlike the St. Louis and John Carroll approaches, the Chicago plan proposed actual unification of the institutions. Mundelein College, Rosary College, and St. Francis Xavier College would merge with Loyola University and DePaul University. The council agreed unanimously to approve the consolidation.

Next, Kelley sought the approval of the Vincentian Visitor of the Western Province of the Congregation of the Mission, William P. Barr, C.M., and the new president of DePaul University, Francis V. Corcoran, C.M.⁷⁹ They approved the plan by March 1931.⁸⁰ Having been the president of St. Louis University's corporate college board and having no adequate means to pay off nearly a million dollar DePaul debt, Corcoran had readily endorsed the Chicago consolidation effort as a necessary remedy to the problems brought on by the demands of the NCA and the Depression.

In April, President Kelley met with Corcoran to devise the implementation of the consolidation effort. Kelley hoped they could develop a single strategy. Kelley and Corcoran met periodically until such a plan emerged. They agreed upon the first action by October 1931: the three women's colleges would merge with Loyola University, while DePaul would retain its affiliated nursing schools and annex any other not affiliated with Loyola.⁸¹ Everything seemed approved. Within a year, Barat College's administration asked Kelley to formalize the merger between the women's college and Loyola.⁸² It became the first college to merge with Loyola on October 15, 1932.⁸³ Within six months, Kelley prepared documents for the incorporation of the other two women's colleges.⁸⁴ The new Catholic university of Chicago seemed at hand.

However, by the end of the summer in 1933, the Jesuit provincial requested President Kelley to resign and assume similar responsibilities at Regis College in Denver. Samuel K. Wilson, S.J. (1882-1959) who had been the dean of the Graduate School replaced him.⁸⁵ With this presidential change, the Chicago corporate college movement stalled.

The Jesuit administration had fueled the fire of the Chicago corporate college plan since 1930 to withstand an NCA financial inspection. Kelley suggested to Peabody in August 1931 that Loyola needed an endowment of \$1.5 million to meet the NCA norms.⁸⁶ The NCA visiting team inspected Loyola University in February 1932. They evaluated all components of the institution to insure its compliance with NCA standards. The much dreaded financial review proved to be unfounded: not only did Loyola have \$1,487,000 in cash or bonds on hand but also \$4 million worth of land assets besides its university property! Although some minor problems existed, the NCA reviewers passed the university in every category, except one. They questioned Loyola's offering of the doctorate in education and history because current faculty members held only one doctorate and one master of arts. They suggested that the administration discontinue awarding the degree until it hired adequate faculty. Finally, they stated that Loyola "should not be dropped from the Association because of its financial condition."⁸⁷ Loyola no longer needed to compromise its Jesuit institutional structure or mission to meet the NCA demands. It abandoned the corporate college plan which ended the Chicago merger. By 1936, all Midwestern corporate college plans collapsed because North Central had "withdrawn its approval of the Corporate Colleges."⁸⁸

The NCA inspection of other Jesuit institutions did not yield such happy results. After the NCA studied the problem of Catholic "living endowments" from 1931 to 1934, it concluded that some Catholic institutions had paid their substantial debts by skimping on educational programs and improvements, e.g., graduate and doctoral programs. The NCA thus confirmed its proposed endowment standards as the new norm. The NCA would soon rule that any Catholic college whose debt exceeded its endowment would be dropped from the accredited list. This signalled a major shift in the NCA's stance toward its colleges and universities.

In response, the Jesuit provincials prevailed upon President Wilson to convene the presidents to reassess their relationship with the NCA. Their agenda for the February 1934 meeting revealed their outrage:

... first; the implication of this recent North Central threat and our united attitude toward it; secondly; whether it is time for us to consider a united withdrawal from the North Central;

thirdly; what our united attitude shall be toward outside regulating agencies; fourthly; whether we should form our own Jesuit standardizing group.⁸⁹

While the Jesuit presidents expressed their anger over this new NCA standard during the depths of the Depression, President Fox who chaired the meeting informed them of the major reason for the change.

... the Association has had to listen to complaints from Protestants that the Catholics were being given too much. They only think in terms of cash and cannot see our point. The committee studied the problem very carefully for three years and knows that even though we have all we say we have in regard to an endowment of men, we also have debts which must be paid in cash. They think that in order to carry on we will skimp on improvements in order to pay the debts, and as a matter of fact that is true. The non-Catholic institutions have debts too but they have no device by which they can make their books show endowments to offset them that is not in cash.⁹⁰

Fox continued his defense by pointing out that the NCA did not desire to drop all the Catholic colleges, but only those with serious fiscal problems. Once again, he pointed out that withdrawal from the NCA jeopardized their Catholic students who wished to continue their education at AAU approved universities. Gradually, Fox won over those Jesuits wishing to leave the NCA. The presidents voted down all four motions. Instead, the Jesuits agreed to unite their forces to influence future NCA policies through various men sympathetic to their aims. For the third time in thirty years, Fox had played the instrumental role in encouraging Jesuit educators to adopt American higher education standards.

Their acquiescence would be costly. The NCA intended to pursue its new standards. In the spring of 1934, it expelled the University of Detroit and Xavier University because of their extensive debt in relationship to their endowment.⁹¹ This NCA action jolted American Jesuit educators.

Nor did the Jesuits have long to recoup before another national disgrace occurred. The American Council on Education (ACE) made public its 1932 survey of the seventy-seven graduate schools offering the doctorate in the spring of 1934. It approved sixty-three institutions as either being distinguished or satisfactory, including Catholic University of America and the University of Notre Dame. No doctoral programs from any Jesuit institution qualified! When the *New York Times* printed the report from the *Educational Record*, the entire country

knew of the Jesuit academic embarrassment.⁹²

Both the NCA and ACE actions created a furor in American Jesuit higher education. A unified response came from the Jesuit general. Ledochowski faced two significant American educational bodies which questioned the academic quality of the Society's educational apostolate in the United States. His 1934 *Instructio* called on the American Jesuits to develop "a new direction and a fresh impulse of Ours [and] a systematized attempt to secure for our educational activities that due recognition and rightful standing among other groups of similar rank and grade."⁹³ He required Jesuit administrations to bring their institutions to the level of the best American universities. Ledochowski appointed Chicago Jesuit Daniel M. O'Connell as *commissarius* to begin this task with the supreme authority to institute the mandates of the 1934 *Instructio* within every Jesuit university and college. After his inspection of each Jesuit institution, he changed curricula, suppressed degree programs, assessed faculty, and sponsored Jesuits to undertake advanced studies at accredited universities.⁹⁴ In these undertakings, he established doctoral studies as the *sine qua non* of Jesuit preparation for university teaching and encouraged each Jesuit university to build its resources to achieve recognition by and membership in the AAU. Ledochowski's 1934 mandate represented the formal turning point in American Jesuit higher education.⁹⁵

One of the important tasks which the 1934 *Instructio* required was the development of a national organization to direct the development of Jesuit higher education. O'Connell called for a meeting of the Interprovince Executive Committee of the Jesuit national education committee which consisted of all the prefects general of studies from the now New England, New York-Maryland, Chicago, New Orleans, California, and Oregon provinces and the Committee on Graduate Studies to begin the national Jesuit Educational Association in Chicago on April 25, 1935. This organization guided Jesuit higher education until the late 1960s. O'Connell's desire to further the 1934 *Instructio* led to the first issue on the agenda: standards for graduate education in Jesuit institutions. James B. Macelwane, S.J. (1883-1956), dean of the graduate school at St. Louis University, chaired the association for this issue.⁹⁶ He had served as chairman of the Jesuit Commission on Higher Education from 1931 to 1934 and had conducted an extensive review of Jesuit higher education in 1932. He presented his report, "Standards Proposed for Judging Graduate Schools," which outlined the requirements for graduate faculty, the organizational structure of the graduate school, the library, and graduate degree programs which incorporated the NCA and AAU norms.⁹⁷ As the first graduate standard for Catholic higher education, these norms indicated the strength of Jesuit leadership in American Catholic higher education.⁹⁸ Jesuit educators thus demonstrated their *qualified* accep-

tance of the modern American university mission with its emphasis on research.

These events affected Loyola University in Chicago. The Jesuit administration improved its graduate school. With the changes in its presidential administration, Wilson decided to ask Francis J. Gerst, S.J. to replace him as graduate dean in August 1933. During the following year, Dean Gerst analyzed the graduate school and gave this assessment: "The Graduate School as at presently constituted would be classed probably as of mid-grade or even below mid-grade excellence."⁹⁹ To improve the school, the dean selected which departments would best benefit from a reallocation of resources and faculty. By 1935, he chose the departments of education, history, philosophy, and classics. Wilson concurred and moved to upgrade the graduate school.¹⁰⁰ Furthermore, the president affiliated the Jesuit scholasticate in Indiana, West Baden College, with the university. Having NCA approval, this move brought qualified undergraduate and graduate Jesuit students to Loyola's degree programs and increased its degreed faculty in August 1934.¹⁰¹ This added about 100 to 150 undergraduate and graduate students and 12 new faculty members to the university. Next, the president added several doctoral-degreed faculty, one in classics and two in education, to complete the first important phase of the graduate rebuilding.¹⁰² He hired 15 more doctoral-degreed faculty members by 1936 (see table 2, p. 101). Moreover, Wilson initiated new research efforts. He began the Institute of Jesuit Affairs, a research institute on Jesuit history, within the Department of History and purchased the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review* as Loyola's new history journal, *Mid-America*. The president also suggested strengthening the English department to include doctoral studies.¹⁰³ Wilson thus improved Loyola's university stature.

External influences quickly advanced his effort. In the spring of 1935, Wilson shocked Loyola's Administrative Council with new NCA internal policies for university class institutions.

It is note worthy that increasingly in the United States the term "university" is restricted to schools emphasizing graduate work. The North Central, for instance, will hereafter designate as a university only an institution offering work leading to the doctorate in at least five fields of academic interest. Even though according to the traditional definition of "university" an institution may have several professional schools and have been hitherto thus entitled to the name "university," in default of developed graduate work it will be known from now on in North Central nomenclature as a "college with professional schools."¹⁰⁴

Gerst and Wilson's actions during the previous three years enabled Loyola University to meet these requirements.

However, the NCA decision caused other Jesuit universities greater difficulty. Initially, the Jesuit administrators from the universities and colleges of the Chicago and Missouri provinces, namely, Xavier University, St. Louis University, John Carroll University, Creighton University, Marquette University, University of Detroit, Loyola University, Regis College, and Rockhurst College, met with O'Connell to discuss this problem in April 1936. They decided that each province should have only one or two universities which conformed to the new NCA norms.¹⁰⁵ O'Connell supported Wilson's desire to make Loyola University one of those chosen for the Chicago province. The commissioner sent Jesuit scholastics and faculty to bolster Wilson's drive to build up five departments to offer the doctorate.¹⁰⁶ By the end of the year, President Wilson reported to Loyola's Administrative Council that the departments of education, history, philosophy, classics, and English would offer the doctorate.¹⁰⁷ By the 1939-1940 school year, Loyola expanded its doctoral production to four departments (see table 3, p. 102), while anticipating graduates in the fifth department. Through the leadership of President Wilson and Dean Gerst, Loyola University had laid an adequate foundation for its research aim. This policy thus determined which Jesuit universities reached American university stature by the 1970s.

The development of Jesuit universities during the third stage of the standardization controversy had been dramatic. The increase of terminally-degreed Catholic faculty, the adoption of an American university mission with the inauguration of doctoral programs and research institutes, and the beginning of actual endowments occurred because of NCA pressure. At Loyola University, Jesuit administrations from 1920 to 1940 acted to acquire university stature. While this resulted in premature doctoral programs to maintain its NCA ranking, this action determined Loyola's university mission. Although the Chicago Jesuits may have eventually inaugurated doctoral studies, Wilson himself asserted "North Central has given us standards that we would never have labored to achieve on our own."¹⁰⁸

V.

There are three main results from this investigation of the controversy between the Jesuits and the NCA. First, the need to increase collegiate enrollments to compete favorably with other NCA-affiliated Catholic institutions represented the major factor in the Jesuit presidents' and provincials' decision to have their institutions accredited by the NCA. Their classical curriculum with its

Latin and Greek requirements and few electives made Jesuit institutions with their nonaccredited degrees unattractive to the growing Catholic clientele in 1920. If the Jesuits intended to have a role in American Catholic higher education in the twentieth century, they had to revise their 1832 *Ratio Studiorum* to comply with standards in American higher education. Second, after Jesuit institutions gained membership within the NCA, the association progressively influenced them to revise their undergraduate curriculum, professionalize their faculties, upgrade the quality of their graduate work, strengthen the fiscal condition of their institutions, and finally inaugurate doctoral studies between 1920 and 1935. The success of these developments may be attributed to three persons who encouraged the Jesuits to affiliate with the NCA. Alexander J. Burrowes encouraged and approved Missouri Jesuit colleges and universities to change their collegiate curriculum and to seek accreditation. Albert C. Fox devised the modification of the 1832 *Ratio*, promoted accreditation for all Catholic and Jesuit institutions in 1920, and succeeded in overcoming the Jesuit presidents' desire to withdraw from NCA in 1934. Włodimir Ledochowski requested all Jesuit institutions to achieve similar rankings with other American universities in his 1930 and 1934 letters, even though he required them to maintain an intense Catholic character. The spirit of his mandates continued until the 1960s. Third, these developments led Jesuit university educators to distance themselves from the older Jesuit college model for the Society's apostolates, to eschew their European university mission with its professional studies orientation, and to adopt the modern American university mission with its research orientation.

This paper has described how the social forces within the Catholic community, the Jesuits' willingness to consider new curricular ideas, and their accommodation to the NCA changed Jesuit higher education. This turning point in American Jesuit higher education led to the full Americanization of Jesuit universities and colleges when they demonstrated their autonomy from the Catholic church by reorganizing their boards of trustees in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

NOTES

1. An earlier version of this paper was given at the 1986 American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting in Division F. The author extends his gratitude to Paul A. Fitzgerald, Kathryn M. Moore, Harold S. Wechsler, and two anonymous *History of Higher Education Annual* reviewers whose comments aided this revision. Further discussion of the issues raised in this article may be found in Lester F. Goodchild, "The Mission of the Catholic University in the Midwest, 1842-1980: A Comparative Case Study of the Effects of Strategic

Policy Decisions upon the Mission of the University of Notre Dame, Loyola University of Chicago, and DePaul University." 2 vols. (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1986).

2. Paul A. FitzGerald, S.J., *The Governance of Jesuit Colleges in the United States, 1920-1970*, foreword by Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C. (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984), p. 3; Joseph A. Tetlow, S.J., "The Jesuits' Mission in Higher Education: Perspectives and Contexts," *Studies in the Spirituality of the Jesuits* 15-16 (November 1983-January 1984), p. 11.
3. Goodchild, "The Mission . . ." 2; pp. 701-775.
4. The Society of Jesus, a Roman Catholic religious institute founded in 1540, seeks to establish Catholic colleges to promote Christian leadership as its apostolic mission. It governs the work of its priests and brothers through a system of provinces throughout the world. By 1928, the United States was divided into four provinces, Maryland-New York (1853), Missouri (1863), New Orleans (1907), and California (1909). In the Missouri province, the Jesuits established nine universities and colleges: St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.; Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisc.; Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.; Creighton University, Omaha, Neb.; University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich.; John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio; Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio; Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Mo.; and Campion College (1880-1925), Prairie du Chien, Wisc. After the closing of Campion College, Regis College, Denver, Co., which was founded in 1921, became the ninth Jesuit institution in the Midwest.
5. Ignatius of Loyola, *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, trans. George E. Ganss, S.J. (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1970), part IV, chapter 2, sections 1-2 [320-321], pp. 176-177. The 1949 Roman edition of the *Societatis Iesu Constitutiones et Epistolae Instituti* gave each paragraph a number rather than following the early four-partite divisions. This new standard reference system will be placed in brackets before the page numbers.
6. The Jesuits operate 28 universities and colleges in the United States, 23 of which have been classified by the Carnegie Commission as either Doctorate-Granting I or Comprehensive University or College I. Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*, rev. ed. (Berkeley, Calif.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1976), pp. 1-25.
7. Frederick Rudolph, *Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636*, Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1981), p. 220.
8. *Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1886-87* (Washington, D.C., 1888), p. 645 cited by David S. Webster, "The Bureau of Education's Suppressed Ratings of Colleges, 1911-1912," *History of Education Quarterly* 24 (Winter 1984), p. 500.
9. Rudolph, *Curriculum* p. 220.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 222.
11. Conference Minutes, 1906 cited by Kenneth E. Young, "Prologue: The Changing Scope of Accreditation," in *Understanding Accreditation: Contemporary Perspectives on Issues and Practices in Evaluating Educational Quality*, Jossey-Bass Higher Education Series (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1983), pp. 2-3.

12. Webster, "The Bureau . . ." pp. 501-509.
13. Rudolph, *Curriculum* p. 221.
14. *Proceedings of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools* (1913-1914), p. 61.
15. Edward J. Power, *Catholic Higher Education in America: A History* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1972), p. 367.
16. Ignatius, part IX, chapter 3, sections 3-9 [740-749], pp. 313-315.
17. *Catalogue of St. Ignatius College, 1902-1903*, p. 11, Loyola University of Chicago Archives, Loyola University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois (hereafter, cited as LUCA).
18. Beginning with the Italian Renaissance, the *pietas litterata* tradition integrated classical and Christian Latin and Greek authors as the basis for a Catholic curriculum of higher learning. See, James Bowen, *A History of Western Education*, vol. 2, *Civilization of Europe Sixth to Sixteenth Century* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975), pp. 428-432 and Allan P. Farrell, S.J., *The Jesuit Code of Liberal Education: Development and Scope of the Ratio Studiorum* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1938).
19. Francis P. Cassidy, "Catholic Education and the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, I," *Catholic Historical Review* 35 (October 1948), pp. 277-278.
20. *Catalogue of St. Ignatius College, 1907-1908*, pp. 19-20, LUCA; Robert Swickerath, S.J., "System of Education," *Bulletin of Loyola University, 1919-1920*, p. 11, LUCA.
21. *Bulletin of Loyola University, 1917-1918*, p. 18, *Bulletin of Loyola University, 1918-1919*, p. 11, LUCA.
22. Swickerath, "System of Education," pp. 8-11.
23. Cited by Thomas Q. Beesley, "Loyola University," *The St. Ignatius Collegian* 9 (November 1909), p. 3, LUCA.
24. Vice-President's Diary, October 10, 1913, 3 vols., 3: p. 242, LUCA.
25. "Report of the General Committee and Prefects of Studies, St. Louis, Missouri, July 1916," William Kane, S.J. Collection (hereafter, cited as WK), File: M1.8, LUCA.
26. Presidents Meeting of the Jesuit Colleges, April 2, 1917, p. 7, Samuel K. Wilson, S.J. Collection (hereafter, cited as SW), Box 26, File 24, LUCA.
27. Alexander J. Burrowes, S.J. to John B. Furay, S.J., February 19, 1919, Box 26, File 24, SW-LUCA.
28. Meeting of College Presidents and Prefects of Studies of the Missouri Province, Campion College, April 14 and 15, 1919, Box 26, File 24, SW-LUCA.
29. Committee on Curriculum and Administration, Report No. 1, July 10, 1919, p. 13, Box 1, Prefect of Studies, File 1, Chicago Provincial Archives of the Society of Jesus, Chicago, Illinois (hereafter, cited as CPA).
30. Francis X. McMenamy, S.J. to John B. Furay, S.J., July 31, 1919, Box 26, File 24, SW-LUCA.

31. Francis X. McMenamy to [John B. Faray], June 21, 1920, p. 1, Box 10, File: M1.1.19, WK-LUCA. Internal evidence points to the letter being sent to the rector of the community.
32. Hugh L. Lamb, "Discussion," in the *Report of the Proceedings and Addresses of the Eighteenth Annual Meeting, Catholic Educational Association Bulletin* 18 (November 1921), pp. 84-88.
33. Albert C. Fox, S.J. to Very Reverend Dear Father, May 24, 1920, James A. Burns Collection, Box 3- Burns Personal Correspondence, Archives of the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana.
34. Albert C. Fox, "The Trends of the Colleges," in the *Report of Proceedings and Addresses of the Eighteenth Annual Meeting, Catholic Educational Association Bulletin* 18 (November 1921), p. 130.
35. Woodstock Letters, 64, no. 2 (1935), pp. 280-281 cited by FitzGerald, *Governance*, pp. 8-9.
36. FitzGerald, *Governance*, pp. 3-4, fails to mention these meetings as being forerunners of the Inter-Province Committee. However, the next Missouri provincial, Francis X. McMenamy, S.J., also attended the June 1920 meeting in New York which called for the first inter province meeting. It is more than coincidence that the first meeting of the Inter-Province Committee took place at Campion College, Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin.
37. Meeting of the Inter-Province Committee on Studies, March 27, 1921, File: M1.27, WK-LUCA.
38. Wlodimir Ledochowski, S.J. to Joseph Rockwell, S.J., October 20, 1921, Roman Archives of the Society of Jesus, cited by FitzGerald, *Governance*, p. 6.
39. *Bulletin of Loyola University; 1920-1921*, pp. 35-41, LUCA.
40. Vice-President's Diary, March 17, 1921, 3, p. 302, LUCA.
41. Ibid., November 23, 1921, 3, p. 311, LUCA. Minutes of the Consultors, St. Ignatius College, March 8, 1922, p. 197, LUCA. The board of trustees confirmed the separation between Loyola University and St. Ignatius Preparatory High School on August 29, 1924; Minutes of the Board of Trustees of Loyola University, August 29, 1924, Office of the President of St. Ignatius Preparatory High School, St. Ignatius Preparatory High School, Chicago, Illinois.
42. The split between the Missouri and Chicago provinces occurred in 1928 after the region became too complex to be administered by a single Jesuit provincial.
43. "Report of a Committee appointed by Reverend Father Rector in February 1926 to study ways and means of assisting our scholastics to do graduate work in the ordinary branches of the College Curriculum," p. 3, Box 1- Province Prefects, File 2- Graduate Work for Scholastics, CPA.
44. FitzGerald, *Governance*, pp. 10-11.
45. Minutes of the Inter-Province Committee on Studies, April 25, 1923, Box 10, File: M1.32, WK-LUCA.
46. Minutes of the Inter-Province Committee on Studies, June 20 to 23, 1924, Box 10, File: M1.32, WK-LUCA.

47. FitzGerald, *Governance*, p. 13.
48. Minutes of the Conference regarding Certain Suggestions of the North Central Association, December 13, 1925, pp. 4-6, File A2.16, North Central Association, WK-LUCA.
49. Minutes of the Inter-Province Committee on Studies, June 16 and 17, 1926, Box 1: JEA, File 2, CPA.
50. Minutes of the Inter-Province Committee on Studies, February 27 to March 3, 1927, p. 3, Box 1: JEA, File 2, CPA.
51. Minutes of the Provincials of the American Assistancy, April 21 and 22, 1927, pp. 3, 7, Box 1: Meetings of the Provincials of the American Assistancy, 1926-1948, File: April 21 and 22, 1927, CPA.
52. Agenda of the Meeting of the Graduate Council for January 14, 1927, Box 26, File 13: Graduate Council 1927-1933, SW-LUCA.
53. Minutes of the Graduate Council, January 14, 1927, Box 26, File 13: Graduate Council 1927-1933, SW-LUCA.
54. Ibid.
55. "History, Organization, and Purpose [of the Graduate School]," *Bulletin of Loyola University*, 1926-1927, vol. 3, pp. 9-22, LUCA.
56. Memorandum, Austin G. Schmidt, S.J., May 11, 1928, Box 26, File 13: Graduate School 1927-1933, SW-LUCA.
57. Minutes of the Deans of the Missouri and Chicago Provinces, December 30, 1928, James T. Hussey, S.J. Collection (hereafter, cited as JH), Box 4, File 2, LUCA.
58. Minutes of the Inter-Province Committee on Studies, December 31 to January 3, 1929, p. 7, Box 10, File: M1.32, WK-LUCA.
59. Ibid.
60. FitzGerald, *Governance*, pp. 21-22; Wlodimir Ledochowski to Fathers and Brothers in Christ of the American Assistancy, June 7, 1928, pp. 2-4, File: A1.20, WK-LUCA.
61. Wlodimir Ledochowski to Reverend dear Father Provincial, December 8, 1930, Box 1: JEA, File 12, CPA.
62. Samuel H. Horine, S.J. to Samuel K. Wilson, June 7, 1934, Box 14, File: U1.22-1.25, WK-LUCA.
63. Minutes of the Graduate Council, April 21, 1931, Box 26, File 13, SW-LUCA; Francis J. Rooney, S.J. to Austin G. Schmidt, May 1, 1931, Box 26, File 13, SW-LUCA.
64. Austin G. Schmidt to Robert M. Kelley, S.J., May 25, 1932, File B11.28, WK-LUCA.
65. Robert M. Kelley to Provincial, November 14, 1932, "Report of the Commission on Higher Studies of the American Assistancy of the Society of Jesus, 1931-1932," p. 2, File: A1.20, WK-LUCA.

66. Robert M. Kelley to Ernest Ruffini, October 5, 1931, Box 27, File 28, SW-IUCA.
67. Kelley to Provincial, November 14, 1932.
68. Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Deans of the Chicago and Missouri Provinces, December 29 and 30, 1933, p. 3, Box 1, JEA, File: Central Region Dean's Conference 1928-1960, CPA.
69. Robert M. Kelley, Diary, March 28, 1933, pp. 87-89, IUCA.
70. Roger L. Geiger, "The Conditions of University Research, 1900-1920," *History of Higher Education Annual*, 4 (1984), pp. 4-5.
71. "Graduate School Statistics," Box 3, File 49, JH-IUCA.
72. Timothy L. Bouscaren, S.J., "The 'Corporate' Colleges' Plan," *America*, January 9, 1926, pp. 307-8, William B. Faherty, S.J., *Better the Dream: St. Louis University & Community, 1818-1968* (St. Louis: St. Louis University Press, 1968), p. 282.
73. Paul L. Blakeley, S.J., "The Incorporation of John Carroll University," *America*, January 25, 1930, pp. 385-386.
74. "Report of the Committee on Financial Standards for Catholic Institutions," *North Central Association Quarterly* 5 (September 1930), pp. 191-92.
75. Minutes of the Provincials of the American Assistancy, April 3 and 4, 1929, p. 8, Box 1, Minutes of the Meetings of the Provincials of the American Assistancy, 1926-1948, File: April 3 and 4, 1929, CPA.
76. Minutes of the Council of Regents and Deans, March 5, 1929 and January 7, 1930, Box 26, File 12, SW-IUCA.
77. Minutes of the Council of Regents and Deans, April 8, 1930, Box 26, File 12, SW-IUCA.
78. Minutes of the Administrative Council, June 12, 1930, p. 2, Box 27, File 11a, SW-IUCA.
79. Minutes of the Administrative Council, October 16, 1930, p. 4, Box 27, File 11a, SW-IUCA.
80. Robert M. Kelley, Diary, October 20, 1930, n.p. and March 16, 1931, p. 75, IUCA; Kelley reported the success of these meetings to the Administrative Council, Meeting of April 16, 1931, p. 2, Box 27, File 11a, SW-IUCA.
81. Robert M. Kelley, Diary, October 17, 1931, p. 290 and October 27, 1931, p. 300, IUCA.
82. Minutes of the University Council, October 6, 1932, p. 2, Box 27, File 3, SW-IUCA.
83. Robert M. Kelley to Rosemary A. Gibney, R.S.C.J., October 15, 1932, File A1 26, WK-IUCA. Kelley informed Reverend Mother Gibney that Barat's corporate union with Loyola would help its enrollments and revenues to meet the NCA obligations. Their signed merger agreement is in this file.
84. Minutes of the Administrative Council, June 8, 1933, p. 2, Box 27, File 11a, SW-IUCA.
85. Robert M. Kelley, Diary, August 29, 1933, p. 241, IUCA.

86. Kelley to Stuyvesant Peabody, August 13, 1931, File A2.24, WK-LUCA.
87. Board of Review, the Commission on Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools to Gentlemen, March 14, 1934, pp. 1-13, File A2.31, WK-LUCA.
88. Daniel M. O'Connell, S.J. to Samuel K. Wilson, January 21, 1937, Box 3, File 44, JH-LUCA.
89. Samuel K. Wilson to Albert C. Fox, February 17, 1934, Box: NCA, File: NCA 1933-1934, WK-LUCA.
90. Minutes of the Bi-Province Committee on Outside Standardizing Agencies, February 24, 1934, p. 3, Box: NCA File: A2.31, WK-LUCA.
91. George A. Works, "Proceedings of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education," *North Central Association Quarterly* 9 (July 1934), pp. 38, 46-47; Jesuit reaction to these actions may be found in Box 10, File: M1.43-M1.47, WK-LUCA. Both Jesuit universities were restored to the NCA accredited list the following year.
92. FitzGerald, *Governance*, pp. 36-37.
93. Wlodimir Ledochowski, "Instructio pro Assistentia Americae de Ordinandis Universitatibus, Collegiis, ac Scholis Altis et de Praeparandis Eorundem Magistris," August 15, 1934 (Woodstock, Mass.: Printed Privately, 1934).
94. FitzGerald, *Governance*, pp. 38-52.
95. Matthew J. Fitzsimmons, S.J., "The *Instructio*, 1934-1949," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* 12 (October 1949), pp. 69-70.
96. FitzGerald, *Governance*, pp. 26-28.
97. Minutes of the Joint Meeting of the Committee on Graduate Schools and the Interprovince Executive Committee of the National Jesuit Educational Association, April 25, 1935, pp. 1-2, Box 16, File 26, SW-LUCA. The final version of these standards developed during the next two years. Edward J. Power, *A History of Catholic Higher Education in the United States* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1958), pp. 354-58 reproduces this final version, "Norms Proposed by the Committee on Graduate Studies of the Jesuit Educational Association for its Guidance in Appraising Graduate Work."
98. Power, *History of Catholic Higher Education*, p. 237.
99. Samuel K. Wilson, "President's Report, 1933-1934," p. 3, File A2.71: President's Report to the Administrative Council 1933-34, WK-LUCA.
100. Samuel K. Wilson to Francis J. Gerst, S.J., February 12, 1935, Box 6, File 4, SW-LUCA.
101. Wilson to Allan P. Farrell, S.J., April 1, 1935, Box 4, File 21, SW-LUCA.
102. Wilson to Daniel M. O'Connell, May 16, 1935, Box 3, File 44, JH-LUCA.
103. Wilson, "President's Report, 1934-1935," pp. 4-5, 9-11, 16-19, File A2.99: President's Report, WK-LUCA.

104. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
105. Minutes of the Meeting of Jesuits of the Chicago and Missouri Provinces, April 23, 1936, p. 1, Box 2, JEA, File: Central Region Dean's Conference 1928-1960, CPA.
106. Daniel M. O'Connell to Samuel K. Wilson, n.d., Box 3, File 44, JH-1UCA.
107. Samuel K. Wilson, "President's Report, 1935-1936," p. 12, Box 27, File 16, SW-1UCA.
108. President Maguire relates a conversation which he had with Wilson in 1950; see: Memorandum, James F. Maguire, S.J. to Michael Mulligan, S.J., August 21, 1958, regarding North Central Board of Review, James F. Maguire, S.J. Collection, Box 9, File 1, Mulligan, 1UCA.

Celebrating Fair Harvard: A Review Essay

SUZANNE HILDENBRAND

State University of New York at Buffalo

Bernard Bailyn, ed. *Glimpses of the Harvard Past*. Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Bainbridge Bunting and Margaret Henderson Floyd. *Harvard: An Architectural History*. Cambridge, Ma.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1985.

Richard Norton Smith. *The Harvard Century: The Making of a University to a Nation*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986.

ALTHOUGH HISTORIANS OF HIGHER EDUCATION have turned away from writing institutional studies in recent decades, the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Harvard College, celebrated in 1986, brought the publication of several histories reminiscent of that earlier tradition. Institutional histories, like campaign biographies, seem destined to mediocrity due to the authors' involvement with their subjects. This judgment is sustained by the works under review. While each of these works assumes that Harvard University has a unique importance in American life, the methodology or style employed prevents an analysis of the origins or implications of that uniqueness. All but ignoring context, they emphasize individuals, relate anecdotes—some of which come perilously close to faculty club gossip—or tell cute tales about "the way it was." Despite the lack of attention given to Harvard's role in, and impact on, the modern American state, and how that role resembles and differs from that of other institutions of higher learning, these works are not without interest. They illuminate the education of an elite; they illustrate the continuance of the "Harvard mystique," and they show the pitfalls faced by historians who undertake institutional histories.

Glimpses of the Harvard Past (1986), edited by Bernard Bailyn, shows what Harvard teaches its young about themselves, their place in the world after graduation, and their university. It contains essays originally prepared as lectures for a "non-credit voluntary course on Harvard's history,"¹ by Bailyn, Oscar Handlin, Donald Fleming and Stephan Thernstrom, all of the Harvard History Department. Lacking footnotes or bibliography, but with charming illustrations,

most from the Harvard archives, the book's primary audience appears to be Harvard alumni. Flattery and self congratulation characterize the book; the only discordant note is struck in the epilogue as Handlin lashes out at critics of Harvard.

One of the book's most interesting essays is Thernstrom's "Poor but Hopefull Scholars," a kind of social Darwinian interpretation of the assumed superiority of Harvard students that links the importance of his study of them to the role played by "Harvard products" in the national life.² Thernstrom's theory is that poverty is no longer a barrier to Harvard admission as a result of the University's generous financial aid program. (Approximately 40 percent of the 1984 entering class received financial aid.) Yet, despite these aid provisions, the socioeconomic background of entering classes has not changed much over the years, and sons of professional and managerial fathers continue to make up a large majority. If it isn't poverty that bars the offspring of lower class parents, what is it? Thernstrom finds that "it is evident that neither the desire to expose oneself to the pressures of an academic environment like Harvard's nor the traits necessary to surmount the admissions barriers are randomly distributed in the population."³

As if in response to critics who may reject his views, Thernstrom assures his readers that elitism is general and that Harvard is more democratic than its peers. He points out that the proportion of students from blue-collar backgrounds is little different at the University of Michigan, a state school.⁴ Furthermore, Harvard was the first of the Big Three to admit more than half of its entering class from public secondary schools.

While charting Harvard's growing democratization over the years—but making few links to parallel changes in American society—Thernstrom deplors the school's past treatment of blacks and Jews. He attributes the continuing scarcity of blacks within the school's student body to the paucity of black youth who can meet the entrance requirements; in other words, it is society's problem, not Harvard's. Thernstrom makes no mention of the large pool of qualified Asian and Asian-American youth who also encounter rejection from Harvard and other elite schools. Thernstrom concludes that "Harvard's reputation for diversity, tolerance and pluralism rests upon solid grounds."⁵

Two essays are devoted to a period called "Harvard's golden age." The time was the turn of the twentieth century, after Harvard President Charles William Eliot's (1869-1909) reforms, based on the development of an elite of intellect and character, had begun to take effect. A major result of these reforms, according to Handlin in his essay "A Small Community," was the linkage of the traditional gentleman's education to a new pursuit of scholarship. "Disinterested knowledge" had become an ideal accepted by all in a community isolated from the concerns of the city.⁶ Evidently no conflict existed between the demands of

research and the mission to teach. Harvard's great growth and increasing involvement with the political and material concerns of the larger world soon eroded this community. Ironically, this greater involvement stemmed from Eliot's conviction that the nation needed Harvard graduates to protect and guide it. But even this decline of the "small community" reminds the students of today of the major role played by Harvard faculty and graduates in government service and sponsored research.

Fleming's essay, "Harvard's Golden Age?" largely reconstructs the undergraduate world in that Golden Age, asking today's students (and his readers) to "suppose you are a member of some class between 1900 and 1910."⁷ He gives some of the flavor of those years by mentioning famous faculty and students, such as Charles Townsend Copeland or "Copey" and John Reed, and describing popular courses such as one in social ethics, popularly known as "Drunks, Drains and Divorce." This approach fosters some rather pedestrian humor: "one cannot be sure that you had a bath today."⁸ In the midst of all this good humor it is startling to come upon a brutal revelation of how the Harvard community built and maintained its boundaries in his observation about "some Cambridge chip-pies" who may actually only have been "brash Irish girls."⁹

The introductory and concluding essays are equally problematic. Historians will have to assess whether historical accuracy or some other purpose is served by Bernard Bailyn's assertion in his introductory essay, "Foundations," that Harvard became a "model for American institutions of higher education."¹⁰ The "Epilogue—Continuities" by Handlin is strangely petulant. He observes that Harvard in the 1980s finds itself on the defensive, a "vulnerable giant," suffering the "petty stings of demagogic politicians" who are insensitive to Harvard's contributions to city, region, nation, and humanity. Still, "worldwide recognition of Harvard's greatness" survives, and Handlin predicts that today's struggles may forge a bond with the pilgrim band of long ago.¹¹ Handlin seems not to have noticed that many colleges and universities are in distress today; perhaps he thinks that the experiences of others have no relevance for Harvard.

To paraphrase Marx, there is a spectre haunting this book: it is the spectre of *The Best and the Brightest* (1972) by David Halberstam (Harvard, 1955).¹² The nation was poorly served during the Vietnam War by academic overachievers whose primary goal was to associate with power and wealth at any cost. In *Glimpses of the Harvard Past* the reader can see how youth, already highly competitive, is encouraged to seek further eminence with little regard for the social consequences. Harvard students are told that 1) their university is great; it embodies major virtues; and it is a model for all others; 2) they are among a handful capable of high achievement; and 3) like their predecessors, they are destined for high places in society. Sophisticated enough to acknowledge prob-

lems safely in the past, *Glimpses* nonetheless links those to society with whom it is less willing to share successes. Furthermore, even when Harvard is acknowledged to be at fault, it usually concludes that Harvard is still doing better than others.

The Harvard Century: The Making of a University to the Nation (1986) by historian Richard Norton Smith (Harvard, 1975) attempts to prove its thesis that Harvard is the nation's university by presenting a history that focuses almost exclusively on the school's presidents. Both thesis and methodology are dubious. In addition, several misleading elements will strike many readers. First, the title, although seemingly echoing Henry Luce's *The American Century* (1941), is never related to the earlier work.¹³ The Luce phrase took on ironic connotations as the American century shrank to about twenty years.¹⁴ Does Smith think that Harvard's hegemony is similarly limited? Second, although there is copious documentation, the work, perhaps due to its biographic emphasis, the heavy use of interviews, and the plethora of undocumented anecdotes, seems intended for a popular audience. Finally, although Smith takes a more critical stance than do the essayists of *Glimpses of the Harvard Past*, he usually finds a way to minimize the ugliness he has illuminated. Some examples: Marxist economists Allan Sweezy and Raymond Walsh were denied tenure, but they weren't very productive anyway; F.O. Matthiessen committed suicide, but he seems to have been weak-minded anyway, and his work has not stood the test of time. If Harvard's record on academic freedom during the McCarthy period was flawed, compromise was vital to protect Harvard, and Harvard's handling of the problem was more honorable than was Berkeley's, a state school. Although chiding Harvard for "sometimes imagining itself to be the fourth branch of government" during the Kennedy years, Smith writes on the same page of the need for a new assessment of Harvard, for the period from Eliot which began "her transformation into an instrument of national purpose."¹⁵

The limits of a focus on the Harvard presidencies are clearly evident in the chapters on James Bryant Conant (1933-1953), "the Dorchester Mr. Chips," and Nathan Marsh Pusey (1953-1970), "the Bishop from Appleton." Although troubled at the outset, the Conant period at Harvard came to be seen as one of great expansion and success. The Pusey period, although it was in step with Eisenhower's America and blossomed under the aura of the national presidency of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, ended in near chaos. This presentation makes Harvard's successes in the earlier period and Harvard's failures in the later period heavily dependent upon the personal qualities of the two men. Yet many colleges and universities prospered during and after World War II, and many were devastated by the events of the late sixties. At Harvard the sense of loss was understandably much greater because its attachment to Camelot had been so

great. The history of Harvard University from 1933 to 1970 is much more than the personal drama of these two men. But that is almost all we get from Smith.

In contrast to subsequent events on American campuses (especially 1968-1970), the days of James Conant's presidency seem tranquil. Only the Red Scare, in its various manifestations, had the potential for disaster that the campus disruptions of the 1960s had. Pragmatic Conant made compromises on this issue that seemed necessary to protect the University, but that infuriated many faculty members who would have preferred a more absolute defense of academic freedom. Although Conant, as all other twentieth century presidents of Harvard had sought to broaden the university's constituency, the increasing use of faculty expertise during the New Deal and war years, and the postwar flood of G.I. Bill students accomplished that goal better than any Conant policy.

Although Smith makes Pusey out to be a better moralist than politician, Pusey seems to have shown numerous instances of political shrewdness. His courageous opposition to Joseph McCarthy, "the other gentleman from Appleton," won him plaudits from the responsible press.¹⁶ He turned a heavy liability, his religious devotion, into an asset by acquiring a million-dollar gift from John D. Rockefeller Jr., which was used to hire such theological superstars as Paul Tillich.

Yet none of these actions could protect Pusey on an April night in 1969 when he called in the police to oust students occupying University Hall. His presidency stumbled on for two more years, but it was effectively terminated that night. Like most competent administrators Pusey had devised a plan to deal with student takeovers. Students were to be ousted, but the President was not to be identified with the action; high level administrators would take the credit, or the blame.¹⁷ Somehow, but Smith doesn't make clear how, Pusey alone was seen as responsible and he was excoriated for the action. His beloved Divinity School was the first Harvard unit to vote a condemnation of the action.

The day of the police action, the Deans gathered at Pusey's home presumably in a show of support. Only the Law School Dean was missing; rumors circulated that he had offered to resign in protest of the calling of the police, but there is no evidence. Distanced from the opprobrium that befell Pusey and those supporting his action, Derek Bok became a credible and successful candidate for the Harvard presidency.¹⁸

A focus on individuals also fosters a tendency to personal anecdotes and *The Harvard Century* contains many. Neither Conant nor Pusey pleased the Back Bay Brahmins. Conant, known to an army of detractors as "Greasy Jim," was not very tactful. When President A. Lawrence Lowell (1909-1933) came to inform him of his selection, Conant promptly inquired about the salary. It was sneeringly said of Pusey, the son of an Iowa school teacher, that he would never have made

tenure at Harvard. While all of this is highly entertaining and demonstrates that success diminishes personal and social handicaps while failure magnifies them, it doesn't really do much to explain Harvard's position in the world.

Another Harvard title is the handsome, richly illustrated volume entitled *Harvard: An Architectural History* (1985), by Bainbridge Bunting (Harvard, 1952) and Margaret Henderson Floyd. While sure to grace the coffee tables of many alumni, its value is not limited to that. In keeping with the trend toward examining the material culture of the past, interest in academic architecture has flourished in recent years. Certainly the photographs of the performance of Aeschylus's *Agamemnon* at Harvard Stadium in 1906, the dining room at Winthrop House, and the common room at Adams House do much to illuminate the relations within the society that created them. And the plans and aerial photographs help illustrate the relationship between Harvard and Cambridge which was, according to the authors, vastly different from the relationship of any of the other early colleges with their neighbors. While most colleges deliberately located as far from town as possible, Harvard has been part of Cambridge since the seventeenth century; and the two have engaged in an "endless dialogue" and in numerous struggles.¹⁹

The work associates style and type of building with the interests and themes of each Harvard president. Again, this arrangement creates problems. It does seem clear that Lowell's emphasis on the construction of residence halls resulted from his desire to restore the sense of community that he felt had been eroded in Eliot's time.

Linking Conant's deep interest in German culture with the hiring of Walter Gropius, a member of the School of Design faculty in the '30s, and his scientific and egalitarian spirit with the construction of science buildings after World War II seem dubious. Many American universities hired refugee German academics in the '30s. Similarly, since there had been no building during the war, and little during the Depression—and since science had been transformed so radically during the war—science buildings were a top priority on many campuses.

Conant's presidency, although it saw relatively little building, marked an architectural watershed. The last building in the old "Imperial tradition," the Littauer Center, was opened in the Tercentenary year, 1936. A decade later, with the opening of the Lamont Library, Harvard adopted "contemporary idiom."²⁰ By the time the Gropius-designed Graduate Center, in typical International Style, was opened in the early 1950s, opposition to the radical change in Harvard's appearance was characterized by "splendid contentiousness."²¹ Proponents of the new style usually offered functionalist arguments and connected it to such social virtues as academic freedom and openness to new ideas.

Pusey's years brought a great surge of building, and saw the construction at Harvard of the only American building designed by the French master, Le Corbusier. That building, the Carpenter Center for the Visual Arts, while undoubtedly a "promethean symbol of creativity," had numerous shortcomings, most notably a serious "disregard for environment."²² Such was the price paid for the decline in functionalist criticism. Numerous high rises were constructed during this period, reflecting growing concern with the shortage of open land.

As anthropology has overshadowed quaint travellers' tales as a way to understand distant cultures, so modern, thematic history of higher education has replaced charming stories of beloved colleges and universities. Cultural, demographic and stratification studies, among others, have replaced the institutional history. The titles under review here are unlikely to stimulate a general revival of the earlier style, even though written by some of the nation's most prominent historians. These works cannot begin to explain Harvard University's position in American life since that position is relative to the position of other universities. In keeping with their celebratory nature these works focus on Harvard and make it the moving force: master of its fate, captain of its soul. But even while noting that these works are sentimental or ideological, students of higher education can learn much about the education of an American elite and the perpetuation of an image from these works. Those students must then move beyond the celebration and towards an explanation.

NOTES

1. Oscar Handlin, "Preface," in *Glimpses of the Harvard Past*, ed. Bernard Bailyn (Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press, 1986), unpagcd.
2. The title is from an eighteenth century Harvard document. Stephan Thernstrom, "Poor But Hopefull Scholars," in *Glimpses of the Harvard Past*, 115.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 125.
4. Thernstrom offers as evidence comparative figures for Harvard and the University of Michigan from the year 1902 only. While there has probably been no significant variation he should have offered data for several years. His Harvard data range from 1870 to 1986. *Ibid.*, p. 124.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 128.
6. Oscar Handlin, "A Small Community," in *Glimpses of the Harvard Past*, p. 110.
7. Donald Fleming, "Harvard's Golden Age?", in *Glimpses of the Harvard Past*, p. 78.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 81.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 80.

10. Bernard Bailyn, "Foundations," in *Glimpses of the Harvard Past*, p. 10.
11. Oscar Handlin, "Epilogue—Continuities," in *Glimpses of the Harvard Past*, p. 131.
12. David Halberstam, *The Best and The Brightest* (New York: Random House, 1972).
13. Henry Robinson Luce, *The American Century* (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1941).
14. Smith does cite Henry Rosovsky on the brevity of the American Century. Richard Norton Smith, *The Harvard Century: The Making of a University to a Nation* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986), p. 309.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 208.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 247.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 258.
19. Bainbridge Bunting and Margaret Floyd Henderson, *Harvard: An Architectural History* (Cambridge, Ma.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1985), p. 18.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 229.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 234.

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

Barbara Beatty is an Assistant Professor of Education at Wellesley College. A former kindergarten teacher and preschool director, her current research focuses on the history of the curriculum in early childhood education and its impact on childbearing.

Patricia Smith Butcher is the Education/Psychology Librarian at Trenton State College Library, Trenton, New Jersey. In 1986, she received a doctorate in the history of education from Rutgers Graduate School of Education.

Lester F. Goodchild teaches in the School for New Learning at DePaul University. In 1986, he completed a doctorate in Higher Education from the Department of Education at the University of Chicago.

Lynn D. Gordon is Assistant Professor of Education at the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, University of Rochester, and a member of the *History of Higher Education Annual* Editorial Board.

Guilbert C. Hentschke is Dean of the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, University of Rochester.

Suzanne Hildenbrand is Assistant Professor at the School of Information and Library Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo. She received her doctorate from the University of California at Berkeley in the history of education. She is currently working on the history of "women's" professions.

Kathryn M. Kerns is a reference librarian at Alfred University and a doctoral candidate in history of education in the Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania.

Ellen Condltffe Lagemann is Associate Professor of History and Education in the Institute of Philosophy and Politics of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, where she also directs the Program for Entry into the Educating Professions. She is currently completing a history of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, entitled *The Politics of Knowledge*.

Dennis O'Brien is President of the University of Rochester.

MANUSCRIPT SUBMISSION INFORMATION

The HISTORY OF HIGHER EDUCATION ANNUAL welcomes manuscript contributions for consideration in future volumes. Manuscripts should be submitted in triplicate, typed double-spaced (including quotations, footnotes, and references) on 8½ x 11 paper, with ample margins. Authors should follow the *Chicago Manual of Style*, 13th edition. The author's name, affiliation, and telephone number should appear on a separate cover page to insure anonymity in the reviewing process. Manuscripts and correspondence should be submitted to Dr. Harold Wechsler, Editor, History of Higher Education Annual, Graduate School of Education and Human Development, 429 Lattimore Hall, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627.